

MAN IN THE PAGEANT OF
THE AGES

by

EDGAR L. HEWETT



ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO

1944

MAN AND THE STATE

MAN IN THE PAGEANT OF THE AGES

Man and the State

By

EDGAR L. HEWETT

D. Sociol.; L.L.D.; D.S.; L.H.D.

SCHOOL OF AMERICAN RESEARCH

AND

MUSEUM OF NEW MEXICO

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO PRESS

ALBUQUERQUE

1944

COPYRIGHT, 1944
THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO PRESS
Albuquerque

Contents

	<i>Page</i>
Introduction	1
The Evolution of the State	5
Toward Citizenship and National Association	43
European Breeds	71
The Limits of Idealism	89
Government Without the State	107

Introduction

IN THIS volume of the series, "Man in the Pageant of the Ages," I have assembled lectures that seem to me to afford a foundation for consideration of some contemporary problems. It is an inquiry into the meaning of history. On the factual side of history we take what the historians have handed out to us. This does not imply acceptance of their interpretations. They have been misled as to the meaning of countless events. They need more study of anthropology. The anthropologists need more study of everything.

Man has always been confronted with problems—always will be. His whole existence is one of relations with conditions about him. Seeing these relations constitutes his intellectual being. His ability to correlate them is the measure of his mastery of life.

In this volume it is proposed to discuss some problems of government. World-shaking events are in process. Great decisions have to be made. New plans will be tried out—plans that will not work if basic traits of human nature and human

society are ignored. The results of ages of evolution must be considered. If we go ahead and create another league of nations in disregard of what the state actually is, we are simply setting up another world-embracing futility. If the blind go on leading the blind, we are in the ditch again. Only by investigation, comparison of notes, discussion, toleration of opinions, and, not least of all, humility in receptivity to truth from whatever source it is derived, can we hope for success. If all this is backed up with an unshakable faith in man's ultimate attainment of the objectives of his aspirations, the result is as sure as the succession of day and night.

In the western world, specifically the European, the state evolved as the instrument for establishment and maintenance of social order. With this phase of historic evolution, the lectures of this volume are largely concerned. These are essentially studies in the *meaning of history* as unfolded in the Old World. That is the record of a vastly different type of life from that which evolved on the American continent prior to the European invasion. The unadulterated culture of the western hemisphere (the Ameri-

can Indian's world) has no counterpart elsewhere. Its remote origins may be detected in northeastern Asia, from whence the native American race doubtless derived, but it is a characteristic product of this continent. It is one of the tragedies in the pageant of the ages that this race could not have been permitted to carry on to the ultimate fruition of its independent type.

With the Indian race the "good way" consisted in keeping right with nature, with man and with the deific powers. This was all embodied in its elaborate ritualistic life. Nature fixed the seasonal ceremonies for planting, cultivating, harvesting, hunting; set by its unvarying precision the example for man in his personal conduct and relations with other men (morals). Nature indicated, too, man's dependence upon deific powers and shaped his efforts to keep in harmony with them through rituals of invocation and other expressions of deeply religious life. Strangely enough, the integration of nature, humanity and deity in the Indian mind and the age-long effort to keep in right relation with all these vast forces almost parallels the ideal uni-

versity course built around the natural sciences, the social sciences (humanities), and metaphysics (philosophy). With the native American race these were the basic elements of law and government. The state as an instrument for the operation of these interests did not develop in ancient America. Hence, the chapter on Government Without the State, reprinted largely from my Ancient Life books, with the generous permission of the publishers, the Bobbs-Merrill Co. A somewhat similar philosophy prevailed in the Orient. This philosophy was expressed in ritual and ceremony typically oriental.

In these excursions into the domain of history and various not well correlated sciences, it may seem that I am getting outside of my legitimate field of anthropology. On the contrary, the interpretations of history, the problems of social and political sciences, education, ethics and metaphysics, must all be approached by way of anthropology. In this "Man in the Pageant of the Ages" series, I am summarizing my conclusions as to human progress and destiny in the light of my half century of study of the sciences of man.

The Evolution of the State

HISTORY is the record of human life on the earth. If we could understand history we could understand life. Since we can, at the present stage of human evolution, only see through a glass darkly, we go on with our quest for knowledge, trusting that in time we may see life face to face. The question, Why do we live? is a perpetual challenge. History affords the material for inquiry as to what purpose man has lived in the past. It should at least disclose to us how not to live in the future, possibly throw light on how to live better in time to come. Taine said of the study of history, "It shows the birth and progress of justice, the ultimate development of nature."

In the study of history, we must visualize a vast pageant to be viewed in its entirety, from man's first dim perception of his place in his world, along the road of incessant striving for more light, to his present position of intelligence. Second only to his efforts to preserve his life was his urge to know. From the physical

standpoint, he had means for finding out—touch, taste, smell, seeing, hearing. For seeing relations, in other words thinking, he was, apparently, less well equipped. Only apparently, however. For the realization of his vast destiny as a creative force in the ^{known} universe, he was endowed with what he needed—an unquenchable urge to inquire, a deep sense of satisfaction in achievement.

But man was constrained to attain knowledge and apply the power acquired with it very slowly, for verily the ancient saying, "Knowledge is power," is so true that one of the most urgent problems of present day civilization is to restrain him in the use of instruments of power that knowledge has placed in his hands lest he use them to his own destruction.

In the early stages of this pageant of time it would seem there could have been little in life to make it worth while. The "abundant life" was not for the caveman. He existed in a cheerless and narrow world. The Unknown was about all there was to his universe. He never asked himself, "Why do I live?" But he was definitely averse to becoming extinct. He never considered what was worth dying for, but it was not well

for any other to molest his mate or his offspring. He perished if need be in defense of his cave. He ganged up with neighbors to protect their groups of caves. The family was a biological necessity, the community an instrument for mutual aid. He practiced the perfectly natural activity of securing what he needed from the earth, the forest, the water, or by depriving someone else of it. He was normally averse to labor, never did himself what he could get someone else to do: even went so far as to commandeer the labor of others—without pay if he were powerful enough, with remuneration if he found it necessary. If exceptionally strong, he became a leader of cavemen and his gangs early acquired the habit of assuming “protective custody” over weaker groups—that is, enslaving them under pretense of saving them from some other enemy. How tenacious are the traits of the caveman! Are men of the predatory nations of today anything other than the cave gangs, equipped with vaster instruments of power?

Nevertheless, the altruistic spirit was an endowment of the caveman, to develop with human association, eventually to play a dominant part

in history, to become the glory of the cultural ages. It atrophied in criminal individuals and in criminal nations of the civilized ages, but in the masses of humanity it never died out. If it had, there would be no humanity—just another animal species, and a low one at that.

In the normal course of unfoldment of mutual aid there came into existence every phase of society. Out of association grew the activities of government, every form of communication, transportation; grew the home, the state, the nation. Communities practiced exchange of possessions for mutual benefit, formed alliances for common protection, developed hostilities out of unfair practices, created barriers out of mutual distrusts.

After the establishment of the home through the discipline and affections of family life, thus laying the foundations for all worth while human relationships—the practice of mutual aid built communities, brought about alliances, and continually extended such relationships to embrace larger federations. Natural boundaries tended to limit such extensions and to establish permanent political divisions, rooted in the soil of

what became a veritable fatherland. Many primitive peoples actually believed that they literally sprang from the soil. With the consolidation of such geographically based populations and the accompanying sense of power, there arose the claim of absolute proprietorship in natural features. To the Romans, the Mediterranean became "our sea," to the German, the Rhine became "*my sacred stream divine.*"

The natural tendency of humanity was toward association, with all the activities flowing therefrom that would eventually result in the organization of the state. No one nation in history could lay claim to the invention of the state. It arose in various parts of the earth and, without exception, in obedience to the need for mutual aid.

Recognition of the advantages of mutual aid was common to man in both the pre-civilized and civilized states of existence, and bred the fairness on which all morality rests. Not without great reluctance do I ever part company with great Dr. Breasted in his noble exposition of the *Dawn of Conscience*, but when he attributes all moral character in man to a great transformation

from an unmoral savage to an age of character, taking place only four or five thousand years ago, I must dissent. Right relationships between men, which is morality, is our heritage from a million years of human association.

The operation of the agency that came to be the state was the concern of all. Democracy or its more practical structure, the republic—representative government—was nature's answer to the need of social groups for orderly procedure in human affairs, such as the establishment of justice, domestic tranquillity, and promotion of general welfare. The objective of all government was, and is, social order. Man knew from the earliest millenniums that these blessings were not to be secured by war. That he was by nature disposed to war is an ancient belief that must be eradicated. The great philosopher of Königsburg, Immanuel Kant, whose essay on "Perpetual Peace," a century and a half ago, still stands out as the most powerful exposition of that subject that has come from thinking men, pronounced an appalling misconception of early man when he laid down the postulate, "With men the state of nature is not a state of

peace but of war." Studies of thousands of groups in primitive society, especially on the American continent, discredit that assumption; disclose the fact that the preservation of peace among the people was of the most serious concern, and that overtures to that end were constantly employed. Kant was no anthropologist.

Slowly, very slowly, man learned that his own individual good would best be served by reciprocity. Association was, and still is, the basis of morality. Out of association grew moral sense, the conception of right relations among men. Slowly, the idea of right was crystalized into custom, eventually enacted into law. The spirit of law is summed up in the word *right*. In the French language our two concepts, right and law, are expressed in the word "*droit*." The merger of these two concepts is man's guarantee of all that he cherishes in life. On the recognition of their identity depends the stability of nations; on their inseparability in practice rests the assurance that man may go on to Olympian heights.

Mankind could and would have traveled the road of peace perpetually had it not been for

two human traits, namely, the inability of men to mind their own business and man's ever-growing greed for power. It was natural that the strongest individuals should be chosen to leadership in times of crisis, for conflict in primitive times called for physical courage and animal strength. These qualities were appreciated when it came to the defense of the fatherland; the maintenance of frontiers; and, as countries became numerous, and the crowding of population acute as in Europe, strong chieftains became entrenched for lengthy periods. People elected their kings when the common safety was endangered, but the idea of hereditary chieftaincy, or kingship, was not of the earliest origin.

With the ascendancy of strong leaders grew the greed for power. Quoting Kant again, "The enjoyment of power inevitably corrupts the judgment of reason and perverts its liberty." From the earliest stages of individual leadership to the present day, men who have acquired power have become obsessed by it. They do not willingly relinquish it. Every specious argument is put forth for its extension—the need for the experienced hand, the perils of changing leader-

ship in times of crises, ultimately the idea of the "Lord's anointed," of divine right—potent devices for flimflamming the people. Curiously enough, men fall for it, and come to distrust the people. So arose the monarchy, dynasty, despotism, dictatorship. These are not natural forms of government. They are the infallible indices of degeneracy in morals, in character, in ideals, in the people. History has known few Diocletians. He voluntarily abdicated the emperorship of Rome and retired to his ranch in Dalmatia. Waited upon by a delegation that came to implore him to return and take up the crown, he replied: "Gentlemen, when you see the cabbages that I am growing, planted with my own hand, you will never expect me to again become emperor of Rome." George Washington was one of the few men in public service to firmly resist the allurements of power. Edward, the VIIIth, of England, laid down a mighty scepter; whether voluntarily or not—who knows?

I have briefly sketched the origin and growth of human institutions which developed out of the inherent nature of man. In this paper I wish to discuss especially man's present relation

to his institution, the state, the expression of his will to freedom.

The establishment, maintenance, and operation of the state as an agency of government and a means to orderly progress is the most serious business of society. Our ideal is that it should be "of the people, by the people, for the people." The consummation of this ideal is democracy. This conception has been realized in two major forms: the British, which has brought forth a commonwealth of independent democratic units, all, including the parent government, responsive on short notice to the will of the people; and the American, a federation of states functioning separately, more or less interdependent, bound together in an indissoluble union and responsive to the mandates of the people in fixed periods. The establishment of our republic under the constitution of the United States of America must be regarded as one of the supreme achievements of man in his march toward freedom. Through an orderly organization of fundamental principles, supplemented by a declaration of rights beyond precedent, a master-work of government was erected which, having passed

unshaken through the convulsions of the past century and a half, must be regarded by every loyal American with something beyond reverence. It is the very apotheosis of human liberty, unequalled in spirit and structure by any other known with the possible exception of the traditionary government of the Pueblo Indians of New Mexico. If the people of the Rio Grande valley, the Pueblo Indian world, had gone on to nationhood, it would have presented one of the finest patterns for representative government ever achieved among men. An individual designated by the people functioned as executive under a Council of head men, ex-officials (elder statesmen) who enacted all regulations for the community life and expected their executive officer to see to their enforcement. He could do nothing without the mandate of the Council and from the end of his year's tenure, he sat among the head men. A war captain elected by the people was coördinate in some respects with the officer whom we would call the governor and in time of war took over sole leadership, to step back when the trouble was over into his commonplace routine functions and, at

the end of his year of service, to a seat in the Council. The governing body was always made up of the community's experienced men. For its officers there could be re-election but no consecutive terms. There were no emoluments of office, no "honest graft," no patronage, no "running for office." Men were called to service by the community, represented the community in all public affairs, including the judicial. There was no glory or prestige in being an officer. It was just part of the day's work. When it came to offenses against the community idea of right and decency, believe me, "the way of the transgressor was hard." But in the matter of punishment, there was no "hangover," such as we inflict upon the ex-offender. The offense was expiated for all time. My information, obtained over forty years ago from men who were old then, was that there were very few "repeaters" in community offenses; also that the Elder Statesmen plan was still regarded by all as "the good way." We note here an echo of an old oriental type of government. Truly . . .

“What you can learn from the yellow
and brown
Will help a lot with the white ”

But it is not with the establishment of representative government that we are now concerned. That has been achieved in a structure that has constituted a pattern for many nations. But in the operation of present-day democracy, we are discovering weaknesses, inherent not in the system but in the nature of man, every one of which is within the power of the people to correct.

The preservation of a dual arrangement, federal and state, has been a matter of extreme tension, the occasion, at one period in our history, of a lamentable civil war. The establishment by force of arms of the principle that the union is indissoluble did not, however, erase the controversy over state and federal rights. Through the opportunism of party politics, it is kept alive to constitute one of the dangerous tendencies in government. The party entrenched in power ignores the traditional theory of the supremacy of the states and carries in

practice federal authority far beyond the limits of the most extreme federalistic principles, the bait of enormous grants from the federal treasury to assist the states in their programs of relief, public works, etc., being eagerly accepted in order to avoid local obligations. An elementary principle or two, honestly adhered to, would eliminate all such confusion. Interests that cannot be confined within state boundaries, such as public defense, foreign relations, forestry, transportation, wild life, citizenship, postal, coinage, and weather service, belong primarily to the federal government. Education, business, local industries, public lands, recreation, parks, health and social security are matters of state responsibility; always keeping in mind that this is a partnership of states and federal government for mutual advantage.

A second alarming tendency is the persistent encroachment of the executive upon the law-making and law-interpreting branches. The position of an executive is one of great power. In the proper exercise of his functions he is under the necessity of calling to his aid many assistants. He has at his disposal countless positions, the

emoluments of which are attractive, but which do not command the services of the ablest and most independent of men. An ambitious executive can, by cunning use of the patronage of his office, erect a political machine which is anything but representative of the intelligence or intentions of the people at large. In only a few instances have we had in our country chief executives sufficiently high-minded to summon the best minds of the land to public service, even in times of crisis. Subservience to the executive is too obvious in the service rendered by appointive officials. The fear of being overshadowed by too capable associates, and desire to prolong his period of power, are weaknesses of many a political executive. In private or corporate business the ablest men to be found are brought into service at remuneration that will command superior ability. Compare the effective running of a great private or corporate business with the conduct of public affairs. In addition to his corps of capable employees, the executive in government can create a vast parasitic voting population. Government by parasites is not acceptable to liberty-loving men.

Any movement toward the surrender of local responsibilities to a centralized authority constitutes a crisis in government. Largess beyond the dreams of greed can be handed out by governments in exchange for power over enterprises and institutions. Beyond the body of necessary and devoted public servants, a horde of non-electives, not necessary to the transactions of the legitimate business of the nation, is a menace in which the people cannot be too deeply concerned. The free man will sternly resist the tyranny of the state.

A factor of extreme danger in government is the perversion of legislative acts by the agents of the executive department. This tendency has come to be called bureaucracy. I have before me copies of a law that has been a federal statute for almost four decades, a law with the drafting and enactment of which I had something to do; the intent of which, therefore, is perfectly well known to me. This law was the result of years of study by scientific bodies, and contains safeguards without which its passage by Congress was peremptorily refused. I am familiar with its operation ever since its passage, under "regu-

lations" which are flagrantly subversive of the intent of the legislation, which could not be amended because of the stubbornness of a single autocratic official. It has been evaded ever since its enactment, and under the pretense of necessary "regulations" has been used up to the present time to accomplish ends not contemplated—in fact, in violation of the expressed purpose of Congress. This is just one among hundreds of instances of bureaucratic regulations being given the effect of law.

The bait of "social security" in the hands of demagogues is an attractive and dangerous one. That which we all devoutly desire, and seek to accomplish by the encouragement of self-help and the rational processes of care for the less fortunate, can by means of the "hand-out" system become a potent cause of pauperism.

To restrain the greed of "classes" is an obligation to which every citizen must be alert. Industry will "charge all the traffic will bear", business will exact enormous profits, labor will pyramid its gains to the limits of avarice if permitted to do so. - Only intelligent citizenship can control these evils

The areas of weakness must be watched if government by the people is to be maintained. Vaunted "consent of the governed" becomes sheer hypocrisy if flaunted with impunity by government in any form. The remedy is simple in theory, and in practice not impossible. Let us review the ideal machinery for the effective operation of a state.

First, a legislative body, elective, non-partisan, unpaid, chosen periodically by the electorate to represent the people in the study of laws, the enactment of needed new legislation, the amendment or revision of existing statutes, the revocation of obsolete acts and review of how the laws of the state are being administered. The study of legislation from these points of view should be the avocation of the legislator during his term of service. His obligation to the state need not interfere with his personal affairs, no matter what his vocation. Anyone intelligent enough and public-spirited enough to be a legislator should find great satisfaction in his avocation. He would be detained from his business for only the time of the annual legislative assembly, and should be happy to devote a few hours a day

for the term of years to the study of laws designed to provide for the welfare of the people of his state. There could be no objection to his reelection if he showed a deep sense of obligation to the people and an intelligent appreciation of his opportunity for public service. Legislation would then become a matter of serious study and not a perennial jockeying for partisan advantage. The legislators are the statesmen of the government.

The official charged with the execution of the laws made by the legislative body is appropriately called the Chief Executive. The term president is not a happy one. The Chief Executive does not *preside* over anything, except his cabinet meetings. He is not a Chief Magistrate. He has no legitimate judicial function. He is not a governor. No body of free men should be *governed* by any one man or submit to the dictatorship of one. The individual chosen by the people to do this necessary executive work should have one sole function, that of executing the laws made by the legislative body. He should know the laws of the state. He should have passionate regard for their enforcement. He

should be the supreme guardian of the laws which the people elect him to enforce. He should continually give information to the people and their representatives as to how their laws are working, but in making laws or coercing law-making he should have no part. His appointive power should be limited to the selection of assistants in the execution of the laws. He should have no veto power. His interference with the work of those whose sole business is law-making should not be tolerated. Of all officials of the state, he should be the most self-effacing, the most steadfast in doing the will of the people. He is not a statesman. He should know his business—and know his place—and not be eligible to re-election. Six to eight years should be the absolute limit of his term of service.

In previous pages, I traced the genesis and growth of the idea of justice. It is not a contribution of any one nation or people to morality and decency among men. It is common to all races and nations, though like all ideals it can be perverted. Out of the desire for justice grew law and all the machinery of government. In

the concept of justice we have the consummate fruitage of civilization. Through courts of justice, nations have extended to all men the assurance of their fellow men that they shall be fairly dealt with. The essence of government is justice. As a young man in Washington, I dropped in, whenever possible, to witness the proceedings of the Supreme Court of the United States. Nothing else ever impressed me so profoundly. I came to feel that here was the *ultima Thule* of men's strivings. I saw it was possible for the people of a great nation to find a body of men incorruptible, consecrated to the one objective of determining justice for all. I invariably came away feeling that this was what man had been seeking for untold ages; I was proud to see it enthroned in my country. I still feel that the Supreme Court is the very sanctuary of justice, the most exalted instrument men have devised for their government. Any attempt to disrupt or debase that tribunal must cause a shock to every thoughtful citizen. The regrettable thing is that it should be subject to executive appointment, or in any way answerable to any except the entire electorate of the country.

I am aware that many for whose judgment I have profound respect believe that the standards of the judiciary would be lowered by popular election. Even if so, I am so firmly opposed to placing the law-interpreting power of the government in the hands of the already too powerful executive that I favor its election by the people. Nothing can move me from the conviction that the people are entitled to say who shall be the judges of their rights and wrongs. For one man to shape this supreme tribunal to suit his purposes or prejudices is to nullify the principle of checks and balances which must be unalterable in representative government. Of all dangers to democracy this is the most acute. The most exacting test of an executive who has the appointive power, or of a people who have the elective, is the construction of the supreme courts, federal and state. There can be no higher function in government. The purpose of all law is to prescribe what is right and prohibit what is wrong. At the base of all law is *principle*. A large legislative body can not always discover that essential in the measures upon which it is called to act. The court must. Frequent divi-

sion in or reversal of decisions does not speak well for a court. It means lack of the highest judicial qualifications. Beware when the courts begin to re-write the constitution.

So, regardless of how selected, it is inexcusable if, for this function of government, the men of highest distinction at the bar, of unshakable devotion to the spirit of laws, insensible to political or personal influence, of character beyond reproach, are not found. "The Constitution is what the Supreme Court says it is" is an outrageous travesty. I can think of nothing more imperative in a freedom-loving country than education on the subject of law and courts.

I have briefly outlined my conception of the relation between man and the state—a counsel of perfection, I admit, but I can conceive of no other government that can meet the age-long aspirations of men. It must comprise:

- (1) A body of legislators, makers of the rules of action desired by the people to insure their orderly progress; elected on a proportional basis.
- (2) A chief executive, the official chosen by the people to see that their laws are enforced

and that the business handed to him by the law-making branch is efficiently transacted.

(3) A judiciary, the final tribunal of justice under the supreme law of the land; chosen by and answerable to the people only; tenure of office to be terminable only on recall by a two-thirds majority of the electorate.

The above should be inviolable principles in a republic. These three branches, coördinate and coöperative, constitute an effective triune structure, if each branch is inviolate in its functioning, and each strictly minding its own business. Nothing else so discredits a representative government as does the arrogant grasping of one branch for power belonging to another. Nothing but confusion can result if the executive is obsessed with the idea that he is a statesman, superior to the body of legislators; or if the judge on the bench presumes to guide legislation. He is an interpreter solely. ("When general principles are previously determined, there will be no perplexity to know what to do." Confucius.) France was distracted by parties fighting, not for principles, but for political advantage. In

the confusion that ensued, her downfall was inevitable. The government of the United States has not been above such confusion.

We regret the susceptibility of the people to demagoguery, but we must remember that they get over it readily. You can't fool all the people all the time. Nicholas Murray Butler has stated with great truth, "Unhappily, the deep lying facts which should be controlling in the life of a civilized people with a historical background are known only to the few, while the many grasp, now at ancient and well demonstrated falsehood, and now at an old and well proved truth, as if each had the attraction of novelty." There is much talk just now about certain freedoms. Do not all men know that freedom of speech, of the press, and of religion have been ours for a century and a half, under our fundamental law; that fear is simply lack of courage, which cannot be ameliorated by any act of legislation; that freedom from want has been man's quest for a million years; and that any attempt to change that other than by the slow process of the ages would be the speediest possible agency for the degeneration of mankind—a species that has

been driven to Olympian heights by the spur of necessity?

The conclusions of this paper may now be summarized.

The state is an instrument that has grown out of the nature of man and, subservient to the people's will, is essential to orderly progress. Like other instruments of power, it has a tendency to get out of control, can even reverse the natural positions of man and state, assume the mastery of the people who have created it, become the imperious destroyer of liberty, and in the last analysis a veritable Frankenstein. This proposition is not debatable. It has fallen to our generation to witness this eventuality—states passing into criminal hands, their helpless people staggering to their doom, victims of unbridled power, deprived of every semblance of liberty. It is the most menacing disaster that has overtaken civilization within the span of recorded events. It has required the utmost resources of sane humanity to meet the evil and destroy it. Apparently, we have had a narrow escape. Actually, we have probably been given time's greatest lesson. Freedom is a state of being essential

to mankind. It has been the quest of uncountable millions for uncountable years. It has been said that such is the nature of man that he would never desire what should be necessary to effect a perpetual peace. This, I challenge on the testimony of his culture history of thousands of years. His eternal quest can be attained through peace. It is not too much to hope that the supreme result of this war will be the education of man to a state of intelligence that will preclude the surrender of his freedom to any power-hungry dictator or group. Is it too much to hope, even expect, that society will be in the mood from now on to promptly eliminate the warmonger—supreme enemy of humanity—even as it has learned to eliminate from the human system the viruses of plagues that devitalize or kill the body? There probably will be no more appeasement of the brutal aggressor—simply elimination. Every son of man must know himself to be a guardian of freedom. It can be won, it can be kept, it can be lost. Yes, even here in our land, dedicated to liberty, that could happen. Therefore, brethren, "What I say unto you, I say unto all, *watch!*" Man must plant himself

upon the principle of representative government, and remain there immovably.

To insure lasting peace, one principle as old as humanity must dominate the council table—that of freedom for all men; one thought must animate the minds of all delegates thereto, that is the idea of justice, supremacy of moral law, in essence, the golden rule. If we have not attained to that conception of human relations, cannot attain it, then the words of the great anthropologist, Ales Hrdlicka, in a letter written to me not long before his death, will be recognized as scientific truth:

The war will not change human egoism nor egotism, it will not make men to be born and developed equal, will not do away with ambitions, or indolence, or vices. Man on the morning after the war will be the same imperfect creature he was on the eve before it, will rapidly forget as he does other hurts, will be confronted with the same natural and other conditions, and will forever have to strive with these if he is to progress, or even hold his own. There would be no surer way to his decadence than the ridding him, even if that were possible, which it is not, of the struggle for existence.

Let us hope for a happier destiny. Let us believe in the ultimate supremacy of morality, in the general likeableness of people. Let us, more than ever, have confidence in the integrity of mankind. At the same time, I know that malefactors must feel the iron hand of destiny.

It is with no thought of vengeance that I hope for the demolition of Berlin and Tokio by the allied forces. I simply believe in nature's way of revealing to humanity its errors. There must be a definite re-education of the people of those nations. It must be brought home to them that venal leaders must be curbed in time. People who cannot govern themselves but look to the state in the hands of power-mad leaders or war groups to order their lives have no place in association with free men. Those who want to get on in the world in harmony with others must keep a heavy hand upon their governments and be prompt in retiring would-be rulers.

Moreover, no people believing themselves to be the sole "sons of heaven," and their emperor a deity, can honestly sit in council with delegates of representative governments, nor can those who have for a thousand years held fanatically

to their claim to being a "superior" race, destined to rule the world. I can find no warrant in history or Holy Writ for the belief that God ever designated any nation as "superior" or gave it dominion over other countries. Nations that hold to such cancerous doctrines will never deal honestly in a league of nations. Their hands will be secretly against every one and every one's hands, of necessity, against them. They will have to remain pariahs until re-educated and adapted to the world-spirit of the age. They, and all nations, must learn that there is strength against which brute force cannot prevail. They must learn to see the vast pageantry of history, humanity as a whole, moving forward, the curve of progress undulating, but steadily upward, all human beings, individuals, or aggregations, animated by an inherent aspiration as imperative as the breath of life, that to freedom—utterly unattainable on surrender to the will of one. That way lies slavery, through which there can be no self-realization. The great disasters of history have had one supreme cause, and that was not economic distress or conflict, as we are so persistently taught. Vicious leaders, gaining ascen-

dancy over the people's minds, have plunged them into blood and mud, and no leader has ever extricated his dupes from the mess. Only the people themselves can do it. I submit that in times of crisis, singleness of command may become necessary, but sustained and strengthened by wise counsel and subject to termination on the collective judgment of those most concerned. The meaning of history is unchallengeable. *No aggregation of people was ever wisely ruled for a prolonged period by one absolute will.* Mussolini ruled the Italian people efficiently for several years, devoted to internal improvement. Then came his delusion of grandeur: Italy a world power; "return of empire to the sacred hills of Rome"; "eight million bayonets" for those who stood in his way; the Ethiopian adventure; the plotting against Spain; the criminal alliance (with Hitler), and then the inevitable deflation and the ignoble end. How much better had he retired to his cabbage patch after ten years of power! A Diocletian rather than a Tiberius! A Cromwell rather than a Louis XIV!

Therefore, I hold that adhesion to a represen-

tative form of government must be an absolute requirement for admission to the council on permanent peace and to the hoped-for world union. It can be instituted only by free people of free governments. All must recognize the origin and spirit of law and be imbued with its sacredness. The two or three remaining dictatorships of the world, that are defying law and decency, will have to give way to representative governments if those countries are to sit in council with order-loving nations. Kant was profoundly right when, in the essay on "Perpetual Peace," he laid down the principle that, "A republican constitution is the only one that is conformable to the rights of man." Law must command the right and its enforcement must be immovable. The outlaw individual or nation cannot be permitted to retard or destroy civilization. Society tolerates law-breaking at its gravest peril. Extinction is nature's effective remedy—witness the saber-toothed tiger, the armored Brontosaurus, and nations that history has written down as criminal aggressors.

Rome considered herself "above the nations," and got away with it for a thousand years. Her

government, no matter what it purported to be, was always one of dictators or triumvirates or war-groups. Roman was the "superior" breed. Wherever he walked the earth, the Roman conceived it to be his privilege to tread upon inferior humanity. He sneered at every mortal so unfortunate as to be of any other citizenship. Government became the will of besotted and power-drunk emperors. Rome became an offense to humanity. Both state and people lost all power of reformation. Time came when a handful of Christians that had developed in subterranean burrows was more powerful than her long-time "invincible" legions. When the Teutonic barbarians (who, by the way were not nearly so barbarous as history has caused us to believe), poured down from the north, Rome was extinguished. There was nothing else to do about it.

Now germinated one of the vastest tragedies of history. The conquerors of mighty Rome were to in turn become "invincible." The Aryan (whatever that is), the untainted blood; the Teuton, the "superior" race; the German state supreme—no pretense of individual ordering of life; no responsibility save to an adored *fuehrer*.

Can Germany survive it? That the putrid Nazi regime must be extinguished there can be no question. It is conceivable that the German people, after their terrible lesson in adversity, may become strong and self-governing, but their present state must die and they must erect a new one in the spirit of this age.

Once powerful Russia had sunk under czaristic rule to helpless impotence, as shown in her part in the first world war. So powerless were both state and people that Lenin with his nondescript half-dozen that had festered in London and Geneva was able to take over the country and start it in a new direction. Lenin, not a "man on horseback," nor a Warwick, nor a Bismarck, just a scrubby little disciple of Karl Marx, bridged over the chasm from national impotence to national revival. From complete economic, industrial, cultural, and military paralysis, from the bogs of bolshevism, arose in a quarter of a century a Russia that exhibits individual and national competence almost without parallel; that routs the most powerful military machine that the world has known.

What brought about the great transformation?

Only Omniscience can tell. My guess is that it was simply the experience of a vast experiment and its terrible failure. The vagaries of Marxian Communism have been convincingly exposed. Even Lenin began the retreat in his "new economic policy." Stalin cautiously continued it. Our ambassador, who surely had great opportunity for finding out, was able to say: "There is no communism left in Russia." Nature's way of educating humanity is by trial and error. Russia is experiencing a magnificent lesson in the value of mutual aid among nations. We may confidently predict a sound representative government for her people. They are of the sort that can rise to it. On the same ground I am mildly hopeful for Germany—even for Japan. Give the people a chance and they will work themselves out of almost any kind of mess. But men and nations to survive have to adapt themselves to the dictates of morality. Nature has enacted and enforces the stern decree, "Adapt or die." Herein is her response to the outlawry of power-crazed individuals and governments that we are seeking now to break and bind that civilization may live. I am convinced that with

the extinction of the two or three dictatorships, the crumbling of which we are witnessing, and the probable election of the representative form of government by all the nations, a perpetual peace may be established. We may give Kant the final word, "Nature, in an absolute manner, wills that right should at length obtain the victory."

It is not within the scope of this work to further consider war as an agency of the state. I simply lay down the proposition that it is all waste, and, carried to the extreme, actually destructive of the state. I suggest to those who are particularly interested in this subject that they study in the light of the best historical authorities the following facts:

1. The valleys of the Euphrates and Tigris (Mesopotamia) are largely desert to this day as a result of the wars of the city-states of Babylonia and Assyria.
2. North Africa remains desert and Sicily a degenerated country as a result of the Punic Wars.
3. Persia has remained a sterile land since her invasions of Europe and Africa.

4. The wars of Genghis Khan and Tamerlane devastated a vast area, China to the Caspian Sea, from which Asia has never recovered.

*Toward Citizenship and National
Association*

“Adapt or Die”

ALL CITIZENS should be partners in their government. Then who are eligible for such partnership? Clearly, only those of biological maturity who can qualify intellectually and morally.

We have endeavored to show in previous lectures that freedom is the supreme goal of man's strivings, and that the only agency that can insure his progress is a mode of social control established through ages of hard experience. It is not conceivable that from here on any people will elect for themselves any other. Democracy is on the way to becoming universal.

Now all who participate in such a partnership will of necessity have to attain to a certain standard of intelligence and must possess a sense of right-mindedness in their relations with one another that we call morality. One so qualified is entitled to citizenship. The law-breaker, the

ignoramus, the bum, the anti-social, the anarchist, should have no voice in the administration of this beneficent partnership—the voluntary association of those who desire orderly life.

A nation made up of such citizens is qualified for membership in an association of nations. The nationalities comprised in such an association must have attained to something like intellectual and moral equality. When they desire to enter such a partnership, they should be required to renounce forever all claims to territorial extension and to trade advantages detrimental to other members. In short, nations must be prepared to act in partnership, as honorable men do in their business relations if they are to enjoy the blessings of perpetual peace. Failure to live up to such covenants should mean exclusion from the group, and conduct outside of the association should be subject to prompt coercion. Outlaw nations must expect the treatment accorded to outlaw individuals by the law-abiding. To that extent I believe in force as an instrument of international policy. Some such unity among nations is essential. The only alternative is the old cutthroat procedure and

endemic wars. It should not be impossible. It is a question of adaptation to the spirit of the time. It can be resisted, but the decree of nature is inexorable. With nations as with species, it is "Adapt or die."

The world has had its gangster nations for many centuries. Assyria, Babylonia, Persia, Carthage, Rome, the empires of Genghis Khan and Tamerlane, were chronic robbers. Pillage, murder, terror were their instruments of power. Absolute annihilation was the world's cure for their atrocities. Only by the total destruction of those criminal nations was civilization able to go on. The Teutonic rulers have terrorized their neighbors for more than two thousand years. They have a record of invasion after invasion, an average of one every fifty years, with alternating success and defeat, from which they have learned nothing. They have at last carried war beyond the limit of endurance, of their own as well as of all other civilized people. It does not require a prophet to foretell the destiny of nations—just the student of history. Germany has always been ready for treaties of peace after defeat—to be broken at will. The Japanese war

cult dreamed of conquest, planned it for ages; insidiously initiated the program some years ago, then launched it suddenly with murderous ferocity. The war spirit has to be broken eventually, even at the cost of complete desolation of the aggressor land. Will anything short of total extermination of the German reich, of the Japanese empire, assure civilization's future? The answer is not to Messrs. Churchill, Stalin, Roosevelt, Chiang Kai Shek. It is the world-spirit that will answer. The German and Japanese people must act quickly and decisively. The people own the state. They own their country. It is up to them to save themselves.

That the highest welfare of each can be attained only through the prosperity of all should now be obvious to all intelligent people. It does not, after all, call for any violent change in human nature—merely an increase of intelligence, and prevalence of the disposition to mind one's own business. We have convincing testimony to this in the pre-war conditions in the Scandinavian countries: education universal; reasonable social security; crime at the vanishing point; a century and a half without warfare.

This is simply intelligence—considerably beyond the average of nations, but attainable by all.

If that is a question worthy of investigation, the answer is clear. It is a matter of *right* education. If my use of a qualifying word here is questioned, my answer must be that education may be desperately harmful; that it may draw out all the evil in human nature, even as it can bring out the good. Of that we have the appalling demonstration in twentieth century Germany, where the ideals of racial superiority, of world domination, of hatred and revenge were systematically inculcated through every channel of the educational program; where the benign philosophy of Kant and Herbart and Rosenkranz was displaced in a generation by the poison of Nietzsche, and the exalted statesmanship of Stressemann and Bruenig by the rantings of Hitler and Goebels and Goering. History discloses no parallel to this hideous perversion of education. As a scholarly German educator, a life-long friend of mine, has repeatedly said: "It has destroyed the soul of a great nation. The happy land of Goethe and Schiller and Beethoven and Humboldt is now a sea of mud and

blood. One can see no joy in life for Germany in the future. We are finished." The preventative against such wreckage in the future is clearly the association of nations. If the "big four" of the present time, Britain, Russia, China, and the United States, whole-heartedly form such an association, with the door open on equal terms to all other representative governments, it is practically certain that Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Finland, Holland, Belgium, France, Switzerland, Italy, Greece, Spain, Turkey, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Austria (some doubt about Bulgaria and Hungary), Poland, the Philippines, and all the Hispanic American republics would hasten to come in. Many of those enumerated are already highly qualified for such a partnership, and those that are not would beyond doubt proceed to qualify. It will be remembered that Russia is already a union of several republics (Asiatic and European), that the British Commonwealth consists of half a dozen strong, autonomous nations, that China will be in paternal relations with the countries of the Asiatic far east, and that the Hispanic nations of America are all under constitutions similar to

our own. One may frankly admit their many failures of the past, but that they, with one exception, are honestly striving and making marked progress, no informed person can deny. I have faith in them, based upon considerable personal contact for two score years.

THE EDUCATIONAL IDEAL

The achievement, then, of the intelligence demanded for citizenship in a nation and for membership in an association of nations comes down to a matter of educational ideals. The imperative mandate to us, and to all peoples, is *educate*; but, educate in pursuance of ideals of mutual good. But whence come those ideals and how inculcate them? That is the business of teacher and parent and of all civic organizations.

More than two score years ago as a young executive, by nature somewhat of a non-conformist, I endeavored to formulate an educational ideal, and under the impression that ideals are of little use until rendered dynamic by concrete practice, I, with the aid of an enthusiastic young faculty, shaped an institution for teacher training as a testing ground. This was the New Mexico Nor-

mal University. The basic principles of the experiment were expressed in a series of addresses to graduating classes extending over a term of years. Reading these over now it is noticeable that, even at that early date, my educational ideals had an anthropological basis. That they still have a certain validity, may be seen when compared with recent educational pronouncements, noticeably one by President Robert Maynard Hutchins of Chicago University in "The Higher Learning in America," a work somewhat unpalatable to university executives and faculties.

In my ideal structure I made the relation of man to Deity, of man to nature (the natural sciences) and of man to man (the social sciences—humanities), the essentials. President Hutchins contends that the student should study metaphysics, the science of first principles; the social sciences dealing with the relations of man and man; and natural science which is the science of man and nature. He asserts that metaphysics, dealing with the highest principles and causes, ordered the thought of the Greek world as well as of the Middle Ages, and that in its

light the social and natural sciences take shape and illuminate one another. He emphasizes metaphysics as an essential "without which a university can not exist." With this I am in accord. President Hutchins does not advocate a return to pre-horse-and-buggy times in education. He holds that there are certain principles that are valid through all time, without the recognition of which chaos results in education and morals. I advocated the same forty years ago. The themes of three of my lectures above referred to were: Man and God, Man and Nature, and Man and Man. I would suggest that the term philosophy be substituted for metaphysics as, when properly defined, more generally understood. The ideal then in education should be a foundation in philosophy, natural sciences and social sciences, basic in preparation for life as well as for professional or vocational studies.

How this experiment looks to its author forty years after is voiced in the following informal talk, in not too serious vein, on the dedication of a new library at the institution. Actual results are, naturally, imponderable.

When we arrive at the fourth day of October, 1938, forty years will have passed since the doors of the Normal University of New Mexico were first opened. My appointment as its first executive, however, dates from 1897, so my connection with it spans full two score years. In the life of an institution that is a short time. It is only one-half of the effective life of a man if he attains to the century of years that constitutes his natural life span.

The inauguration of this new institution was an occasion of high anticipation. To have had a part in it has been one of the profound satisfactions of an active life. Pioneering has always been my job. It was a zealous young faculty to whom was entrusted those initial years; small in number, youthful in age, aflame with the enthusiasm of a great opportunity; loved by the small student body for their unpedagogical comradeship; protected from the hazards of the unknown by abysmal ignorance; tolerated, perhaps even admired by the community. In their audacity, they launched out on a joyous expedition. To that young group a man of fifty would have been considered a Methuselah. I recall that

once when the venerable president (I was then thirty-two) felt called upon to admonish them for some social indiscretion, the senior member of the faculty, himself about twenty-three, I think, earnestly pleaded, "But, Mr. Hewett, you should remember that you are no longer young."

I went down to the Castaneda Hotel one day to meet a congressman who had come out to consult me about certain matters in New Mexico. I approached and spoke to a man who looked as I thought a congressman should look. I guessed right, but I did not measure up to his ideas of what a head of an institution should look like. After a few minutes he said, "I thought the old college president was coming down to meet me." I said, "Well, I am the old gentleman." He confessed that his mental picture called for a frock coat and grayish whiskers.

That first administration lasted five years. It was a happy time, as youth always should be. The school grew in numbers: we beat the State University and Agricultural College at football—occasionally. We set up a high academic standard for that time. Our graduates went into positions of responsibility and made good. Our

students made enviable records when they went to higher institutions. The moral tone was high—the religious equally so. We held daily prayer service, because we thought New Mexico needed it. Our young faculty grew in grace, in years, and numbers. But soon, matrimony and other casualties broke the ranks. Larger institutions discovered them and called them. So disintegration set in. Finally, the Governor of the state decided that we had reached the proper age for retirement (our average was between twenty-five and thirty years) so he packed the Board on us and, after a hectic finish, we all went on to our respective destinies and the Normal University to a “New Deal”; though in those days the “Square Deal” was the popular slogan.

We make no claim to great achievement in those early days. Perhaps we lighted a torch of inspiration that has never been extinguished. Possibly we laid some foundations that have stood the test of time. If so, they may be discovered in the published utterances of that period, for, with the rashness of youth, we never hesitated to proclaim our faith and intentions.

In a very real sense, my connection with the

Normal University never ceased. My faith in its high destiny has never wavered. It would not be possible in these few minutes to point out the milestones that mark the course of its progress. While teacher training has always been its major function, it was necessary, in those early days, to consider it one of our agencies for general education. Our now great State University had not then found its stride. It was an attenuated high school. All our state institutions were moving haltingly toward their positions in the educational system. Our secondary schools were rudimentary. We all did the best we could to help toward that essential of democracy, an educated citizenry. Even yet, I am not much concerned about our specializations. I am interested in engineers and doctors and teachers and lawyers and archaeologists, but most of all I am interested in MEN. It does not matter much what your institution is called or what its specific work is; it must never forget that MANHOOD is the metal that we are trying to discover and forge into the structure of our state and nation. We need not worry about specialists if MEN are available. The

making of a specialist for any vocation is a matter of a few years. The building of manhood commenced in generations past, and, if parents and educators and communities do their duty, it will be the chief concern of society through ages to come.

It would be a gracious thing were I to call by name a roster of those who, as regents, executives, teachers, students, patrons, friends, have contributed to the life of this institution, and who, in well beloved memory, gather with us here today. But I would hesitate to attempt it, even if time permitted. The history of an institution, like the history of humanity, is simply what has come to pass through lives in association with one another. There can be no accurate "roll of honor" among men. The thought never before uttered, the deed never before done, may spring from the silent influence of mind upon mind, of life upon life, the true source of a great inspiration remaining forever unknown. The real authors of the noblest thoughts and deeds are not seen or known of men. So I could not justly ascribe credit to particular ones for the building of the Normal

University. They were your neighbors and mine, your friends and mine; our associates of blessed memory who found rich reward in doing things together. My friends, the strong towers that endure through all time are those that we build with and for one another. My hope is that in the future, as in the past, all in this community may share in the educational work of this institution by joining in the creation of a spirit, broad, tolerant, friendly—a spirit of good will and helpfulness that will yield great dividends on what you have invested here.

That investment has been of a dual character. I can say of the citizens of Las Vegas that I have never known a community to do more in proportion to its means than it did for its Normal School in its early days. They raised money beyond all our expectations for the completion of that first splendid building, according to the architect's plans. When the state legislature restored the contribution to the community, every dollar of it was turned over to the regents to use for the benefit of the school; and I have never heard one word of regret from any contributor to that investment. I believe it has

been felt from the beginning that from the economic standpoint alone it was worth many times the cost.

But the other phase of the investment was the paramount one. Intellectual and spiritual values are, after all, the most substantial. The Normal University has been a place to lay educational foundations for the children of this community at home, where the soundest of all foundations, from time immemorial, have been and ever must be laid. It has given our people a common interest to strive for, to protect; for the Normal University has had its dismal periods when it needed the help of every friend. It has brought to your city an atmosphere of culture that has drawn the best people to make their homes here. It has sent out into the state to serve it in the most responsible of services, graduates of high character, of splendid ability, of devotion unsurpassed.

Building an effective educational system in New Mexico has been no easy job. Now, after two score years of life among our people, watching with deep concern every agency that has entered into the building of our state, I come

here to tell you that your Normal University has well and nobly done its part; has justified the faith of legislatures, governors, and friends who brought it into existence and provided for its support. It has returned to the state in the most substantial of values many times over what has been invested in it. It has had its ups and downs, it has halted and wavered at times, but high ideals and devoted efforts have prevailed. It stands today a monument to its founders, a worthy possession of our state, a high testimonial to the ability of those who are conducting it now. Today there will be handed over to it a new evidence of our faith, which we have gathered here to dedicate. I witnessed the dedication of that first structure which crowns this hill, a veritable rock of ages, which expressed from its foundation the aspiration of the Normal University for noble buildings. How fitting that it now bears the name of New Mexico's distinguished citizen, Honorable Frank Springer. I knew the plan for this auditorium in which we are assembled, from its inception, as a memorial to the well beloved Adele Ilfeld. For some of the other buildings, perhaps the less said the better.

I venture to remind you that, speaking of the building of human life, the stern old German philosopher laid down the command: "He who has a bad character must create for himself a better one." I suggest that buildings may easily be made over. A creative imagination and a master hand can bring this group into architectural harmony. It is one of the duties of the state. We cannot overestimate the influence of great buildings. They are the outward evidences of nobility enshrined within. Two factors are inseparable. The old Greek philosopher uttered an immortal truth when he said: "When within a beautiful form there is enshrined a beautiful soul, that shall be the fairest of sights for all who have eyes to see."

Let us remember that however admirable may be the outward form, that which is enshrined within is the immortal soul. Buildings cannot make an institution. Only the Living Spirit can do that. Buildings can house the libraries, laboratories, classrooms, where faculty and students can search the enduring values of life. It is to enable them to carry on that quest for truth that we build college halls. Every added

facility, such as this new building, is an expression of our faith in them, of our intentions to back them up.

We summon teachers and students to a great responsibility, even as in this, our system of democratic government—greatest achievement of the human race—we summon from among our associates men and women upon whom we lay the burden of public service. How vital it is that everyone so called, from the lowest in the ranks up to the chief executive of the state, have our earnest, loyal, liberal support!

THE EDUCATIONAL STRUCTURE

Citizenship should be the goal of elementary education and participation in its privileges and duties, the reward of those who work for it. This will determine the fundamentals of the educational structure. The cornerstone of the edifice is the public school, free to all from primary to high school inclusive, roughly of age six to eighteen years. In compulsory education, I have no faith. The term is an absurdity. Compulsory schooling is possible; compulsory work more effective.

Education cannot be forced upon an individual, neither can it be upon a community; moreover, it need not be. Among the common people of many countries, even some decidedly "backward" countries, I have found few communities that did not desire, among their most insistent wants, education for their children. Among the pioneers of the middle west, many of them illiterate themselves, faith in education was an almost pathetic trait. Men and women made every conceivable sacrifice to get their children educated. Within twenty miles of my boyhood home, on a farm in Illinois, five colleges were founded and maintained by the people (without government aid); these being preceded by numerous academies and seminaries. Residents of the towns, without number, opened their homes to boys and girls who came in to "work their way" through college or high school. What these struggling institutions, founded and maintained by the people, did for citizenship in these United States, is beyond calculation. Some of those that survive are the best schools in America today.

So we can trust the aspirations and sound

sense of our communities and leave education, and most of their vital interests, in their own hands. No state, county, or school district should brook federal interference in education. Individual and community responsibility have made this country great and made a government capable of acting with unbeatable power in times of crisis.

It is not within the scope of this paper to discuss the public school as our chief agency for the education of the young, farther than to admit that, as a builder for citizenship, it has still far to go. If the ideal presented above has validity, teachers must be produced who can escape the limitations of the classroom; who can lead in the exploration of nature and life out where actualities are to be found; always looking forward toward an understanding of nature's orderly ways and seeing the right relations between human beings. Increase of intelligence and morality is the goal. Don't relegate the latter to a secondary place. Home, church, school, social organizations of every kind, must concentrate upon this if ideal citizenship is to be attained. Preparation for college should be

strictly a by-product of the common schools. Moreover, schooling is not everything. Elementary education must be extended to groups in which age is not considered—education which gives full credit to the values of experience in life. I have known cowboys and cobblers who were better educated than some Ph.D.'s.

In this paper I cannot go into the vast subject of adult education, further than to point out what a vital phase it is of education for citizenship. It is fundamental in rounding out the elementary education essential to life in the state.

The superstructure of the educational edifice is the university. This brings to mind a campus, lecture halls, library and laboratories. Rightly understood and rightly constructed, the university should embrace all the elements of higher education that prepare for life in the world. Its advantages should be available to all whose minds turn to the highest values of life.

President Hutchins says: "The most striking fact about the higher learning in America is the confusion that besets it." The statement is approximately correct. But are we not rapidly

approaching a period of clarification? The necessities of the time are clear and imperative. The university should not recede for one moment from its traditional position as the exponent of sound learning, the upholder of the disciplines that made for intellectual power. The natural and social sciences (humanities), together with the tried and proven metaphysical disciplines, are exactly what President Hutchins claims for them. Note carefully three of his sayings:

The higher education is concerned primarily with thinking about fundamental problems.

The fundamental problems of metaphysics, the social sciences, and natural science are, then, the proper subject matter of the higher learning.

In summary, then, the university would consist of the three faculties, metaphysics, social science, and natural science. The professors would be those who were thinking about the fundamental problems in these fields.

He is right. The university so constituted has been for centuries a potent means for the educa-

tion of straight-thinking men. It always will be. The cloister has served its noble purpose and that mission is not finished—never can be. “The gentleman and the scholar” will forever, let us hope, be the gracious product of the university. But evolution has done its work, too. We are emerging into the broader world horizons. The university cannot remain cloister-bound, or campus-bound. Our world is taking on vastly increased significance. Man must learn to find his way about in it. That calls for reliable guidance. For that wise and fearless guidance what better agency could be afforded than the university—the university dedicated as of old to the development of power to think straight and now further dedicated to the application of that power to the exploration and mastery of the rapidly unfolding world conditions.

So we face our world as it opens up to us and, without undue haste, and without pulling up by the roots the cultural achievements of the past, meet the inexorable changes that nature imposes. Added to the traditional university structure must be all the elements of education that prepare for life in the world. As the elementary or

foundation schools afford at least the minimum preparation for participation in the privileges and duties of citizenship in the state, so the university must become just what its name implies. It must be the experimental agency and the testing ground for all the requirements for participation in world affairs. Professors must become explorers, scouts, torchbearers of evolving civilization.

These young men coming back from the war, millions of them, will be congesting our universities, while finding their new trails into the world's activities. They will know a lot that our present-day professors don't know. Do our university executives realize how imperative will be the necessity for strengthening faculties? Professors of far greater intellectual and moral stature are going to be essential in meeting the demands of this war-sobered student body. It will call for fearless men, and the university chair must be beyond executive or political influence.

There will be necessary considerable reconstruction in the educational superstructure. Unification of the offerings in liberal arts, profes-

sional, vocational, and research schools must come about, with great increase in off-campus activities—field schools, individual projects, the breaking up of mass education. My own state of New Mexico should lead in such reconstruction. Its past blunders, irreparable mistakes we have thought them to be, can be turned to good account. I refer to the multiplicity of higher institutions, created and located from political motives. These separate, unrelated schools are ideally situated to become partners, organic units, in a great "University of New Mexico." Retaining their local boards of regents, public lands and other resources, their autonomous faculties; functioning under a general board composed of the local regents; proportional partners in whatever appropriations the state legislature can allocate to higher education—there could come about an elimination of local jealousies, of competition for appropriations, of failure to maintain standards such as have occurred in the past to the detriment of students. All should maintain the A.B. and A.M. degrees, the diploma of each being of "The University of New Mexico," one central institution providing

the Ph.D. and professional courses such as law and medicine.

With such a unification of its forces, New Mexico could have the most efficient system of higher education in the United States, and without invoking federal aid or tolerating federal interference. The partnership that I advocate here is analagous to the association of nations that I so firmly believe in—independent, autonomous units, joined for mutual aid, with no supergovernment.

European Breeds

TO GET at the meaning of history as enacted through the ages in the old world, it is necessary to know the different breeds of people who have played leading parts in the drama. It is not within the scope of this work to inquire into the causes that brought about the differentiation of the early population into Nordic, Slavic, Teutonic, Anglo, Celtic, Sudic, and their subsidiary breeds, each with distinctive physical and psychological traits. There are no sharp dividing lines between these areas, territorially or ethnically, but in each there is predominance of the breed assigned to it. Infiltration from one to another has gone on immemorially. There is no perfectly pure stock anywhere. This has been the cause of the endemic strife over frontiers in Europe and makes the establishment of boundaries satisfactory to all a practical impossibility. It might be done by exchange of populations, which worked happily in Greece and Turkey, but this plan, generally applied,

might possibly intensify the "nationalism" that is already the curse of Europe.

In a wider study of world culture, I have tried to investigate the broader geographic and ethnic factors in European history. This has involved extensive study of archaeological evidences in the field and in museum collections. Another phase of the subject is pressing. The sciences of man cannot wait much longer for somatic research in the field of race mixture. This is the most imperative call for a well-equipped laboratory of anthropology.

For the present, I will discuss only two outstanding human developments in Europe, viz., Hispanic, a branch of the great Sudic, or Mediterranean stock, an extreme case of nation building through intermingling of already well-established breeds; and Scandinavian, an equally extreme case of ethnic virility through survival of dominant traits under national vicissitudes that have eliminated the weak—the best example in the world for illustration of the story of climate and culture.

HISPANIA

In ancient and medieval times, Spain was "the end of the world." When the Pillars of Hercules, guarding the strait of Gibraltar, were passed on going west, the only reality that remained was water—vast, mysterious, myth-inspiring. A pall of superstition, of terror, hung over the westward expanse. Here man stopped, except for occasional feeble excursions, until a Genoese sailor, one of the unconquerable spirits of all time, pushed the curtain aside. Christopher Columbus, though born Italian, was given to the world by Spain, and, thereby, Spain stepped to the climactic point in world history.

Columbus was not Spain's sole contribution to the super-manhood of that age of high adventure. On his track, and beyond his destination, went Cortez, Pizarro, Alvarado, Coronado, Las Casas, and a dauntless host, carrying around the globe the spirit of a great people. It was something that transcended ambition for wealth or power or even religious fervor. It was the age-long quest of man to know his world; and it was the manhood of Spain that pushed the frontier of knowledge westward to meet the Orient.

The ethnic stocks that made up that indomitable breed were many. Iberian and Celt, Greek and Roman, Phœnician and Carthaginian, Goth and Vandal, and others in lesser proportion, entered into the racial blend that made the Spaniard of the sixteenth century. Each had its elements of power. Each had played a valiant part in human history. From the soil of Spain the archaeologist of today can retrieve fragments of the culture that was contributed by each of those virile stocks.

The forging of the Spanish nation was the work of centuries. Countless forces beat upon that varied population, apparently threatening to destroy, but actually welding it into unity. Even the conquest of the peninsula by the Moors from Africa, and its occupation by that alien breed for nearly eight hundred years, served to awaken its spirit and enrich its culture. The wars with the Moors, culminating in the siege of Granada and the final eviction of Islam, together with the American adventure, made Spain a nation. With the uniting of the kingdoms, Castile and León, Aragon, Andalucía, Galicia, Viscaya, Asturias, Estremadura,

Valencia, Catalonia, Spain became a world power.

Three vast achievements—the conquest of the Moors, the launching of the American enterprise, and the uniting of the kingdoms—immortalized the name of Isabella, the Catholic Queen. Then came the centuries of colonial expansion, of acquisition of wealth and power, supremacy in art, architecture, and learning; then exhaustion, impoverishment, and decline. The war with the United States of America, in 1898, marked the end of an epoch and the beginning of a new era—one of internal development, long deferred by reason of foreign preoccupations.

Visiting Spain a number of times since the beginning of this century, and living there last year (1935-36), I came to know a people of purposeful action, reforming a nation on more stable foundations than ever before. A program of road building was under way that would make accessible hundreds of Spain's most fascinating spots, and give isolated communities outlet to a larger world. Industries were being fostered, education and culture being revived. An effective government was emerging, well suited to the

genius of the Spanish people, who are essentially democratic. A substantial gold reserve was accumulating as a basis for a stable currency and commercial credit. Travel was pouring in and leaving its contribution of cash for the upbuilding of the country.

The fine spirit of the Spanish people was shown in their attitude toward those for whom a resentful feeling might have been expected. Over and over, I heard it said: "We Spanish people owe much to America for relieving us of our terrible colonial burden. Our young men no longer have to go out to die in Cuba and the Philippines. They are at home, raising families and building up our country." Internal development was the great new objective in Spain.

"But," you ask, "what is there to develop in Spain?" Let me say, there is no country in Europe more capable of self-support. She has within her boundaries almost every resource needed for human welfare. Geographically, Spain narrowly escaped being an island. Her vast seacoast and good harbors facilitate commerce, and the products of the sea furnish an unfailling supply of food. The fruits and vege-

tables of both tropic and temperate zones are abundant. The wheat and maize lands of the plateaus are adequate for bread. The pastures maintain the stock, mainly cows, goats, and sheep, which supply milk, meat, and wool. Vineyards and olive groves constitute an enormous resource. The forests and quarries afford unlimited building material. What is little known is that Spain is rich in the useful and precious metals.

In the thirteenth century, Alfonso the Wise said of his country:

Of all the countries in the world, Spain has the greatest abundance of blessings. It is bounded by a cape, by the Pyrenees mountains which reach to the sea, by the ocean and by the Mediterranean. Spain is like the Paradise of the gods, watered by the five great rivers—the Ebro, the Duero, the Tajo, the Guadalquivir, the Guadiana. Between every two of them are high mountains and great plains, vast and wide, and thanks to the richness of the earth and numerous rivers, the fruits of the soil are plentiful. The greater part of Spain is watered by streams, and there are wells wherever they are needed. Spain is rich in grain fields,

fruits, fish, milk and its products. She has plenty of game, cattle, horses and mules. In these times the country is protected by castles, happy with good wine, and has plenty of bread and metals—lead, tin, quicksilver, iron, copper, silver and gold, also precious stones and every kind of marble.

El Sabio was well within the truth. Spain can be a self-sustained country. It should be known, however, that these resources are not so lavish as to connote easily obtainable wealth. They are there in sufficient abundance to reward industry and sustain a population in moderate comfort, but not in luxury. One sees no dire poverty in Spain, nor display of wealth. It is an enviable condition for any country.

Such is the background, geographic, economic, against which we must see the picture of present events in Spain. I would ask you to note especially that out of their greatest vicissitudes have come Spain's most substantial developments. Out of the conquest by Rome, before the Christian era, she derived skill in the building of roads, bridges, fortresses, and castles; the passion for oratory and spectacular sports;

mastery in war and statecraft—even giving emperors to Rome. Out of her subjugation by the Moors, in the eighth century, came the beauties of architecture and color which are the glory of Spain today, and fighting the Moors prepared her sons for the American adventure. Her conquest by Napoleon was not lasting, and served to strengthen national fiber and implant democratic aspirations. Her defeat by the United States liberated the wider thinking which brought out a program of internal development and laid the foundation for more general prosperity than was ever experienced before. Out of her victories came exhaustion; out of her defeats, substantial progress. In short, the anguish of disaster would seem always to have enriched Spain in spirit and to have endowed her with new elements of life.

The foregoing analysis of the Spanish situation is made in the light afforded by a sojourn of several months in Spain, just prior to the outbreak of the present war, living in one of the principal foci of unrest in that country—the city of Malaga. In addition to this, I knew Spain under the monarchy, under the dictator-

ship of Primo Rivera, and under the republic that succeeded the monarchy.

Two years ago, Spain was a prosperous country; its people law-abiding, minding their own business, absorbed in a fine program of public education and internal development; devoted to art, music, science, peace—everything that makes for happiness in life. Today it is a desolated land, the victim of a dastardly plan that threatened the welfare of the world; a devastation that she shares with other innocent nations.

Spain is now in a desperate position. She became the battleground of one of the most despicable invasions of all time. The traitor, Franco, was simply the creature of Mussolini and Hitler. It means extreme impoverishment, the prostration of the country for many years to come. But she will eventually drive the invaders from her soil. She always has. It took centuries to get rid of the Moors, but it was accomplished. Spain has always thrived on adversity. Prosperity has nearly ruined her more than once. The Spaniards have been among the most remarkable people of all ages. It may be the result of the great race mixture. That was the

stuff that made the conquistadores superb in physical courage and endurance. With that ancestral endowment, Spain still carries on. It is the spirit that held the people to a great objective for eight centuries. I need not enumerate the incidents in history that have tested the Spanish people. Time after time, Spain has been invaded by enemies from without; time after time, she has been disrupted by agitation from within; but never has Spain failed to rise stronger than ever from the strokes of adversity. She will survive and *not as a vassal state*. The invader will eventually go out. Spain will repair her ruined cities and restore her devastated lands. She will go on with her internal quarrels as usual. She might recall the monarchy, but hers are essentially democratic people. At all events, they will work out their destiny, rising slowly and certainly to the level of the best of mankind. We may confidently expect Spain to become one of the strong, enduring democracies of the world.

In time, she will adjust her internal situation and go on minding her own business in the future as she has in the past. Spain is no inter-

national trouble-maker. That should commend her to the world in this time of arranging international relations by blackmail.

We, here in the American Southwest—in all America—must know that Spain's cultural heritage is our heritage, that her history is our history, that her contribution to us was not a backwash from a decadent civilization, but an advance guard of the hardiest forelopers of her most dauntless age. In every line of human endeavor you may draw from Spain pictures of life at its most dramatic height.

SCANDINAVIA

Unlike Hispania, Scandinavia is of comparatively unmixed stock. It is a family, Sweden, Norway and Denmark, of almost pure Nordic breed. The Scandinavian people were made into the great race that they are, not by the mingling of various racial elements, but by the survival of the fittest in a single ethnic stock. The Nordics (and the Scandinavians are the only people who can claim that classification), have no tradition of immigration from some other part of the world. With their fiords, forests,

wintry blasts, snow-blanketed hills and valleys, arctic twilights, ice-bound lakes, delightfully stimulating summers, they are Scandinavia.

Little need be said about Nordic origin. Nothing is known about it, or ever will be. My guess is that they are descendants of the unbeatable aborigines, who survived the ice ages of Europe. Anyway, they belong where they are as do the reindeer, polar bears and glaciers. No weaklings have shared in the building of those powerful frames. The climatic vicissitudes of the northern lands eliminated the unfit relentlessly. Strong mentality was just as inevitable under that discipline as was the powerful frame. Don't think that the immovable Swede whom you find hard to convince is stupid or cantankerous. He has to be stubborn. He is of the Norse breed that licked the Atlantic Ocean at its worst—Norway to Iceland, Greenland, Labrador, Cape Cod. He pushed the northern horizon back, following the glacier inch by inch as it backed up toward the pole. It took stubbornness and more and more stubbornness and resourcefulness to win out over such adverse nature.

Several thousands of years for almost uninterrupted development were allotted to Scandinavia in the drama of history. Her soil has been singularly free from invasion. All three of the countries of that great northern land went through the stages of organic struggle that are essential to the forging of strong peoples. In the unrivalled collections in the museums of Sweden, Norway and Denmark and in the mythology and legendry of their literature, their culture history is preserved in marvelous completeness. Nowhere else in the world is the meaning of old Stone Age life so clearly expressed. Not generally appreciated is the beauty of that cultural epoch. It is written into the very fiber of the Norse people. The softer moods of nature induced veneration and love of outdoor life. The vicissitudes of climate compelled a life at the fireside—long nights for song and story; for amusements and industries; for handicrafts and arts; for all the influences that consecrate the home with its associations and affections that build that most precious of all human endowments, character. The natural resources of the country, forests, wild life, minerals, were

wast but available for man's use only by way of hard, wholesome work.

So man in the Norse lands passed through the cultural life of the Stone Age, emerged into the Age of Iron, equipped in body and mind for entrance into the activities of civilization; integrating the endowments of a far past, physical, intellectual, spiritual, that enter into the making of matchless men.

Study of the Scandinavian countries in our time (just prior to the present world war) gave one the impression that here as perhaps nowhere else in the world had the people met and mastered their problems of living. Their attainments in science, art, industries, education, social and economic order, government, commanded profound admiration. In their sports, recreational life, amusements, they exemplified the best in wholesome living. Cities clean, free from slums; a prosperous happy countryside where home life reached the ideal; establishments for housing the aged, with nursing and medical care when needed, and provision for self-help by way of gardening, horticulture and small farming; hospitalization for all as needed,

at trifling expense; education universal; law-breaking at the vanishing point—this characterizes Scandinavia of five years ago. Driving out from Stockholm, I inquired about a large imposing building on the hill. "Formerly a state prison, sir, but no inmates for it; so now it is one of our large high schools!" came the answer.

I never saw an undernourished child in Scandinavia, nor a poor, underfed horse, cow or pig. Studying deeply into the influences that made those countries and people what they are, one finds throughout the strength and beauty of the old Stone Age culture, carried through to the substantial civilization of today.

Not that Scandinavia has been free from the turbulence, the dislocations, the reverses that have beset all humanity. She had her centuries of battle with neighbors; of piracy (that's what the Viking period really was); of aggression; of conquest; of defeat; of civil strife, ending in the conviction of a sensible people that war was nothing but wanton, senseless waste. Through the nineteenth and to now in the twentieth century, the Scandinavian countries have demonstrated the blessings of perpetual peace.

When the aggressor nations of our time have fought themselves out and gone down in the doom of defeat, as all aggressors in history have, will it ever again be possible for a crack-brained fuhrer to delude a great people into the vagary of a "new order" by way of mud and blood, when blessed Scandinavia stands as an example to all mankind of prosperity and happiness unmatched in history; attained through courageous enterprise; determined conquest of environment; internal tolerance; non-interference in the affairs of other countries and devotion to the ways of peace?

The blood and brain cells of the valiant Norse were not left behind when they migrated to America, where hundreds of thousands of them have infiltrated our population with priceless ancestral virility. And they didn't come looking for a soft snap. They chose the hard lands, the northern part of the northern states. They love the old vicissitudes that made men of them.

The Limits of Idealism

IN NUMEROUS lectures and in a few published papers, I have discussed the cultural activities that are rooted in man's inherent urge to beautify his surroundings and the works of his hands while devising material improvements thereon. The activities manifested through love of color, line, sound and various modes of expression may be grouped under the term, esthetics. The cave paintings of European Dordogne and Altamira; the frescoes of Southwestern Pueblo kivas such as Kuaua; the architectural and sculptural embellishment of Central American temples—the decoration of articles of utility; the rhythmic and melodic adaptation of nature's sounds—all testify to an innate love for and desire to create the beautiful. The action of imagination upon these phenomena, the effort to transcend nature, may be designated as idealization.

To the unrestrained play of fancy we owe the esthetic achievements of humanity. In this domain there is little reason for restraint. The

products of the imagination are outgivings of individual spirit that afford satisfaction to self and pleasure in giving it to others. We are here dealing with language that is common to all. There is no conflict of interests. The entire human race can unite in the enjoyment of the things of the spirit. Not without sound anthropological reason is Roerich's thesis that beauty is capable of unifying the race. What matters the nationality of Phidias, Shakespeare, Goethe, Raphael, Beethoven, Dante, Velasquez? They belong to the world. Out of the over-soul of man they speak to and for mankind. There are no limits to esthetic idealism.

When it comes to the activities of association on the material plane, the situation is vastly different. Men in their relations to one another find themselves in ceaseless conflict of interests. To harmonize these interests to the extent that society may exist, requires rules of action. In the very nature of man, restraint becomes necessary, government an essential to orderly existence. At the same time, one of man's everlasting strivings is for freedom, and the restraints of government would seem to imply the negation

of this concept. The purpose of this paper is to discuss the limitation of idealism in government.

The necessity for rules of action in human relations is so obvious that any consideration of anarchy, or order without law, is uncalled for. However, to secure order in society with the least possible coercion is a sound working ideal. Recognition of the right of each individual to have a part in the making and enforcement of such rules would seem to be evident to all thinking people. Such was the thought in the minds of the men who forged the anchors of our liberty here in the United States of America:

We hold these truths to be self evident; that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

In all human utterances there is no more cogent expression of practical idealism for the guidance of men in the organization of society

that we call government. To establish a reign of law and at the same time assure to all men the liberties which have been the goal of ages was the stupendous task to which the founders of our republic set themselves. So great was their success that, in the light of a century and a half of trial, while receptive to extensions of our supreme law that are indicated by the changing times, we look with passionate disfavor upon radical modification of its major provisions; upon cunning evasion of its restraints; and upon ill advised innovations. In the light of an ideal that has been at least approximately realized in our country, we are disposed to sternly demand of idealists in government a program that will permit man to go on with his quest for liberty in the spirit of effective law, protected from a fantastic idealism which, if realizable, would enervate the manhood that has been attained by hard, relentless contention with difficulties.

In a commencement address at Knox College, June 14, 1939, I attempted to show that, next to the will to survive, the quest for freedom has been the most imperative urge of man through all the ages of his existence. I did not announce

an ideal; I stated a fact. I am willing to accept the estimate of a million years, or whatever the anthropologists agree upon, as the length of time in which man has been engaged in this striving. Freedom from the comfortless cave, from want and disease, from fear and superstition; freedom to think, to come and go unmolested; freedom at any cost has been the goal of man's striving as long as he is a normal man. I see no indication that it will ever be otherwise.

Has he advanced toward his goal? Yes, immeasurably. He has arrived at the point where he glimpses his divine attributes. He has always been a creative creature, and is beginning to know it. He will more and more actualize his creative powers. But evolution is a slow business. It means growth, development, change. Human nature adapts to new conditions, but slowly. Sudden changes disrupt, disorganize, destroy. Man has not gone forward by leaps, but by slow, ceaseless effort. When he has tried short cuts he has usually come to grief or confusion, as in the Zuni folk story of *The Untailing of Men*.

Moreover, there is no generally accepted idea

as to what constitutes freedom. Huckleberry Finn had his notions about it, as most human beings have. To him, freedom meant sleeping in his own hogshead; in not being compelled to have his ears washed, or having nice people "scrub hell out of him." India clamors loudly for freedom but isn't insistent upon sanitation. Most of "the silent, sullen peoples" resent being tidied up by outsiders who want to jump them over the centuries and know how to do it. They may not like their cholera and plague, but still less do they like to have their ears washed. When people make a mess of things they want to find it out for themselves and remedy it themselves.

All of which simply means that evolution, progress, is a matter of selection. What we of the "enlightened souls" can do is to walk humbly in the best way we know and be ready to help the "benighted ones" to the better way when they see it is better and ask for it.

Vice President Wallace announces that "the people are on the march toward even fuller freedom than the most fortunate peoples of the earth have hitherto enjoyed." True. It could have been just as truthfully said at any time

in past millenniums. It has been a long march, and there is a long way yet to go. His dictum, "America will not have made her contribution until ninety per cent of the adults of the world can read and write," and "until all the children of the world can have at least a quart of milk a day," is a fine example of superlative idealism. But he should tell us what per cent of the world's billion adults we have been able to bring up to the reading and writing point in a million years, and what per cent in his age group that he calls children have up to now been enabled to taste milk—except the mother's.

President Roosevelt announces Four Freedoms which I suppose he considers attainable in the "new World Order" that we are getting ready for, viz.:

1. Freedom from want
2. Freedom from fear
3. Freedom of speech
4. Freedom of worship

Well, these are all in man's million year program, and, as said above, great progress has been made; but let us not get the idea that its realization is just around the corner. Man will be

hammering away at it for uncountable generations to come, and every few hundred years will, as in the past, set up a new landmark of liberty, as Magna Carta, and the American Constitution. Perhaps the Atlantic Charter may turn out to be one. But Mr. Roosevelt, in holding out his Four Freedoms, should be careful not to awaken hopes for an immediate standard of living that is attainable only in remote future time. He is in position to arouse vast expectations which can lead to vast disillusionment. Moreover, if government should be able to provide freedom from want at the cost of freedom from responsibility, I would be for holding the business in abeyance for a while—a long while. The building of men and women of character and ability throughout the world is our most imperative duty now. In my judgment, responsibility has done more toward bringing humanity up to virile manhood than any other factor in human evolution. I want assurance against the helplessness of old age and disease made as absolute as possible, through the care of those whose natural responsibility it is to provide it. Parents who have slaved and worried through the long

years of the infancy of their children (one fifth of the life span), to give them subsistence, education, happy life and economic inheritance, are entitled to equal care in return. Nations in which children have been put out to nurses, thereby relieving parents of responsibility, have speedily gone down. Nations in which the care of parents can be shifted to government are inviting a lowering of moral standards that can mean only one thing—the rapid degeneration of the population. Let us have security attained by the affectionate self denial, the devoted sacrifice of leisure, of wealth, of comfort, on the part of those upon whom nature has laid the sacred obligation.

Whatever is man in the sons of men,
Whatever is staunch and true,
We owe to our sires and their sires again,
And mothers of mothers who mated when
The world and its heart were new.—*Lummis*.

Vice President Wallace envisions a “new democracy” in which “there will be a place for everyone—the worker, the farmer, the business man, the housewife, the doctor, the salesman, the teacher, the student, the store clerk, the taxi

driver, the preacher, the engineer; all the millions who make up our modern world." Well, our good old American democracy has afforded opportunity to millions, mainly for those who sought a worthy place and everlastingly worked to secure and fill it. Mr. Wallace is holding out a prospect that is too roseate. Millions will fall for it and millions be disappointed. He reaches beyond the limits of attainable idealism.

Now I am not deprecating idealism in government. I am simply groping for something that is possible now, or next year, or whenever this global convulsion is over. I am not appalled or depressed over the confusion that prevails in the minds of men when they talk about the approaching day of furling the battle flags; but when I note the diversity of views among ten thinking men, I wonder how long it is going to take to get a hundred million in one country to agree—how long to get a majority in sixty countries to come together on any program.

In the discussion of peace plans that is now going on, the subject of "leadership" is much in evidence. Who is going to lead the world in

the Utopian New Order and keep it functioning? Many proclaim Britain and America. Many broaden the base to include Russia and China in the hierarchy. Multitudes narrow it to America alone. Sound, intellectually balanced Dr. Harold G. Moulton of Brookings Institution says:

“How an ordered free world is to be established and maintained will depend largely on the leadership and policy of the United States. Leadership is already ours; the policy is foreshadowed in the declarations of our responsible leaders, but it has yet to take definite form.”

Vice President Wallace lays down principles to guide us in the building of the new democracy that the United Nations hope to build. Two of these are home rule and centralized authority. He doesn't explain how we are to harmonize these two diametrically antagonistic ideas. I have always clung to our constitutional preamble: “We, the people of the United States, in order to,” etc. But we see “the people” rather eagerly handing over to the federal government their democratic responsibilities and the agencies that were created to represent us

in legislative and judicial affairs—Congress and Supreme Court—surrendering their obligations to a willing executive, obviously accepting leadership in preference to responsibility.

Now the most elusive, mystifying, treacherous concept in the psychology of the human race is that of "leadership." While the race on the whole has surged toward freedom, there has been continual lapse to servility and serfdom. Can anyone explain how a great people could in a single generation shift from the enlightened leadership of Hindenburg, Stresemann and Bruening to that of the loathsome trio, Hitler, Goering and Goebbels?—From a heroic Garibaldi to a blatant Mussolini?—How in our national Hall of Fame in Washington the statue of a saintly Frances Willard can be flanked by one of the blatherskite Huey Long? Even when the call to leadership is a matter of free choice, we may see a mediocrity chosen and an Aristides banished because his people have tired of hearing him called The Just. We must admit that too often the electorate will elevate a charlatan over the most high minded man in the community. However, in the long run the people

lead, and generally they resent leadership that is not of their own choosing. I, personally, feel that in planning the world peace, America can and should have a large part, but I sincerely hope that the talk of "American leadership" may be promptly repudiated. "American mastery" is still more objectionable. Free men and free nations are not going to yield their hard won freedom to the guidance of Uncle Sam, who is still quite young and inexperienced. Indeed, we ourselves should not want to see him sitting on top of the world. It would mean speedy ruin. We should hope to see him bending his back to his share of the load for some ages to come. That would make a man of him. And is there no way of suppressing the statesman who proclaims the Pacific ocean, or any other sea, a future American lake? Could anything be worse in the way of future international arrangements than for any nation to be allowed to pre-empt the high seas? I hope that "balance of power" and "regional arrangements" are out, likewise. They are fertile sources of trouble. Human nature being what it is, every one of these devices is doomed to failure.

The believer in true democracy is moved to inquire, "Why leadership at all?" Are there not enough grown-up people in every civilized community, in all the civilized nations, to divide up and wisely carry the responsibilities of government? Nations should, as a matter of course, have whatever form of government their people want and be permitted to experiment at will, so long as they mind their own business. Each one should work out its own neighborly relations. Freedom of travel and trade, one would think, would be encouraged by all intelligent people. It means profitable business and it means mutual respect and good will. Intolerance of other peoples' ways disappears with acquaintance.

Suppose we pick up the threads of civilization where broken off, and go on our way without further talk of "new world order," simply providing for the world what we do for our communities, viz., a law-enforcing agency. We know that humanity as yet has to be policed. Every nation in Europe would welcome a return to its prewar status, assured against assault by aggressive bullies and permitted to go on with the working out of its destiny. Every one of

those countries was on the way toward the only system that will ever satisfy the nature of man: that is, the right to solve its own political, social and economic problems. That means democracy, the only way that has been discovered whereby humanity can achieve its highest welfare. The small nations do not constitute Europe's post-war problem. They were far and away the best governed, the most prosperous, the happiest of the nations of the world. It will be many a year before the peoples of the big nations can be as happy as were those of Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Holland, Belgium, Switzerland, in the pre-war years.

Suppose we start where we were when the self-appointed "Duce" and "Führer" went on the rampage and enlisted enough weak-minded followers with visions of supremacy to throw the civilized world into convulsions. We had attained to:

1. A League of Nations, conceived in the exalted spirit of friendly association and conference.
2. A World Court, created for the purpose

of establishing justice among nations by the only decent method that humanity has devised.

3. The Kellogg-Briand Pact, entered into voluntarily by all the civilized nations, renouncing war as an instrument of national policy.

Does not this combination of agencies embrace about all the dreams that are attainable by humanity at its present level? What more could we hope for? But, it didn't work. Why? Simply because of failure to recognize that there are criminals in nations as in communities, who have to be restrained by force. Had Mussolini, Franco, Hitler been promptly manacled, would the people of their respective countries have surged into war? Out of considerable personal experience in every one of those countries, I can testify that there was no clamor for war by the people until whipped into mania by the venal leaders that have ruined their countries.

What, then, shall be our procedure? Not in an unworkable idealism of endeavoring to establish a "new world order," I hope, but in practical common sense, recognizing what it is that we have to work with; starting the car

of progress where it bogged down and enlisting the well disposed peoples of the world in keeping it going. I suggest the following:

1. Restore the enslaved nations to pre-war status.

2. Manacle the aggressor nations—their leaders and war cults—by means of an international police force.

3. Restore the League of Nations, the World Court, the Kellogg-Briand Pact to their intended functions.

4. Find if possible one concept of righteous relations among men on which humanity, out of enlightened self-interest, if nothing more, can unite.

Is such a concept possible? Has humanity ever found anything on which there can be practical unanimity?

Among the Arabs there is an unwritten law of the desert which for ages has stood virtually inviolate. The wayfarer, even though he be an enemy, is received at the tent of the sheik, is given food, shelter, protection; is speeded on

his way with assurance of security. Is this almost unbelievable altruism? Not at all. The host knows that tomorrow he may be the wayfarer, may have to seek aid and comfort from some fellow being in order to preserve his own life. "Therefore, whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so to them." Here is one workable ideal capable of being established as a universal law; one rule within the limits of idealism that does not depend upon race or language or nationality to become an effective guide in all human relations. If we could embody just that one law in the peace plan and make its observance as inviolate as is the law of the desert, we would achieve enough for this and for countless generations to come.

The limits of idealism are clearly defined within the human nature of every generation, and can be extended from age to age by trial and error—in other words, by open-minded experimentation, not by revolution, or by pulling up by the roots the culture of age-long growth and starting all over again. Let us continue to build upon the heritage of the race.

Government Without the State

IN MY *Ancient Life* series I have sketched the cultural development of the human race on the American continent. Here efficient government was attained without the agency of the state. With the permission of the publishers, Bobbs-Merrill Company, that analysis is herewith reprinted.

THE HUMANIZING OF A CONTINENT: THE AMERICANIZING OF A RACE

"Humanize: To convert into something belonging to man."

Before starting upon the study of human life in the great Southwest, some consideration of the general history of America will be necessary, for the history of the Southwest is only a chapter in the story of the single race that explored and settled a vast continent extending from Alaska to Patagonia. It involves no record of a succession of races, no account of conflicting nations engaged in the everlasting strife for supremacy that constitutes the major part of Old-World

history; in fact, no consideration of nations at all, for that form of human society never evolved on the American continent.

Much of the ancient history of America must be recovered by the pick and spade, but the task of the American excavator is a vastly different one from that of the Old-World archaeologist. Digging in the earth structures of the Mississippi Valley, the ancient pueblos and cliff-dwellings of the Southwest, the shell heaps of Florida or California, the pyramids of Aztec Mexico, the temple precincts of Central America or Peru, he is uncovering the works of a single race, the American Indian. There is no stratification of diverse cultures as in the Old-World. Layers of débris, if any exist, represent simply the stages of development of the red race. No evidences of Bronze-Age man, nor man of the old Stone Age, are encountered. Literary records are non-existent. Yet the archaeological remains denote a civilization in advance, in some respects, of Old-World contemporaries; a race that without building cities, writing books, maintaining armies, erecting and tearing down nations, was nevertheless making history.

So one is compelled to blaze out new trails when it comes to the study of man in the New World. Traditionally, the history of America begins with the "discovery" in 1492. Now, that date does mark an important episode—the first piloting of sailing vessels across the Atlantic Ocean, an episode comparable with the first piloting of an airplane across the same sea. But neither feat was a discovery. I can not recall ever having heard the question asked, "Who discovered Europe, Asia, or Africa?" There is no reason for asking it. I know of no reason for thinking that America ever was discovered. The human animal probably wandered back and forth over the Arctic lands without knowing or caring whether he was in Asia, Europe or America. There may have been for ages as much migration in one direction as the other. Man could not penetrate farther north, but to the south there were no barriers no matter which continent he was on. And he never stopped until he covered the habitable globe. Upon which continent he originated no one knows, nor ever will know. The quest for the "Cradle of the Human Race" must take its place along

with other follies of science. It is as much a myth as the lost Atlantis.

If history is regarded mainly as a record of the actions of individuals and peoples in erecting and maintaining nations, then America holds little of historic interest prior to four hundred years ago. If it embraces all the efforts and achievements of the human mind and all the forces that influence human evolution, then America affords another preëminent field for historical research. It molded one race, which, unmixed for millennia, spread over the vast continent, distributed itself in early stages into almost every conceivable kind of environment, responded as any animal will to every physiographic change. The results of this long experience are seen in the varying forms of culture—industrial, esthetic, social, religious and linguistic. The stages of development are well represented by archaeological remains and the surviving intellectual possessions of the living people. The former class of evidence is buried in the débris of time, the latter submerged by foreign influence. Peoples of the desert, the plains, the mountains, the coasts, the islands,

the snows, the jungles, still exist in their environment of ages. Probably nowhere else in the world can the reaction of a land upon its human population be seen so convincingly. Therefore, the prevailing lack of knowledge of the history of America can be remedied even in the absence of literary records. The process by which America was humanized is by no means a sealed book.

When in the course of time this continent was peopled, it enveloped its population in a profound continental isolation for some millennia. Ethnic unity was established and preserved. There was magnificent space in which tribes might develop without acute conflict of interest. There was infinite opportunity for adventure, for the development of leadership. Chieftaincy arose without resulting in kingship or overlordship. The sense of individual freedom was too great to permit of dynastic government. It was always of a representative type. The race took its character from the soil. Its physical being, its unique mentality, related intimately to nature. Its variations in culture illustrate the response of racial spirit keenly alive to forces

which meant so much in the life of the people that they were deeply venerated. These beneficent powers, recognized in the warmth of the sun, the fertilizing action of the rain, the reproductive response of the earth, brought the gifts upon which life depended, and for which man owed ceaseless gratitude. His delight was in the expression of that sense of dependence in song, in dramatic ceremonies, in the building and embellishment of temples for celebration, in the adornment of the body and of articles of domestic and religious service in color and in character symbolizing the forces so venerated. The life thus evolved was preëminently esthetic and religious, though these activities were so intimately organized with the industrial life and the social order that the result was a completely integrated culture. Thus America received and reacted upon its earliest human population. The result was the *Indian*—the aboriginal of the New World—a race Americanized.

America shaped a people of distinguished physical type. In every respect it bears the stamp of nobility. In bodily proportions, color, gesture, dignity of bearing, the race is incom-

parable. It was free from our infectious scourges, tuberculosis and syphilis, and the resulting physical deformities and mental degeneracies. It was probably free from leprosy, scrofula and cancer, and it is safe to say that nervous prostration was unknown to the Indian. It does not pertain to that superb physical composure and serenity of mind. The race held out well toward the end of the human life cycle. There were numerous centenarians. These physical characters belong with matured, disciplined, controlled mentality.

There are those who will question the accuracy of this description. A more prevalent picture is that gained at transcontinental railway stations of beings of unwholesome appearance in the unclean nondescript clothing of white people. Many have no other impression of the Indian, and judge the race therefrom. We must do away with this picture and get the archaeologists' view of America of a thousand years ago. We must see the race as it was prior to foreign contact. We would not judge the ancient Hebrews by the ghetto, or Anglo-Saxons by the down-and-outers of the city slums. The

early misconceptions concerning the native Americans would be ludicrous had the results been less tragic. One much exploited tradition was that of savage cruelty. This well-nigh accepted belief was acquired during the period of eviction from the soil from which these people had derived their magnificent physical and spiritual character. It was a purely human reaction, and to have made it the predominant thing in the record of the Indian would have been unpardonably false.

Judged solely by the work of his hands, as seen in the remains of his monuments, temples, sculpture, fabrics and utensils, the Indian takes an eminent place among races. These achievements faithfully reflect his peculiar mentality and constitute his imperishable record. His unique intellectual attainments, his conceptions of nature, life, deific power, his exalted spiritual vision—these purely immaterial products of his mind to which he gave expression in dramatic ceremony and song—seem destined to disappear.

The European brought to the Indian world (America) a densely materialistic mind developed by ages of experience in human society

that could have no other destiny than that which has overtaken it. It was a racial mind formed by immemorial strife in a restricted environment—an environment which fostered distrust, war, destruction, armament for offense and defense. All this was accelerated by the discovery and use of metals. In the chaotic ethnic conditions of ancient Europe, kingship, overlordship, dynastic government, were inevitable, and individual freedom well-nigh impossible. European nations developed one common characteristic, that of using force for all purposes. Small nations fought for existence, large ones for expansion, powerful ones to impose their will upon others. Plans were devised from time to time for getting along with one another, but always to fall back after a brief trial upon the primal method of tooth and claw. Such a life tends to disintegration of cultural activities, industry, esthetics, religion and social order.

The European mind was not prepared to understand a race so different from its own in character and culture as was the native American. Its disposition was to subdue, to subjugate and to convert. One can readily understand the

paralysis that would overtake a non-warlike race in such an unequal conflict. To subdue was comparatively easy with the superior material equipment of horses, guns, and training in destructive warfare. To convert was a different matter, involving the eradication of age-old culture, the destruction of the soul of a race.

To realize how nearly complete was the subjugation of the native American race by the European, one has only to see the abject servility of the peon Indian from Chihuahua to Peru—an enormous population hopelessly arrested. Contrast with these, tribes of the same countries and of the United States and Canada which remained unconquered, “uncivilized;” those which retain their self-respect in the face of powers which would destroy their tribal existence.

It seems now that this first great experiment in the evolution of human society in America is at an end. The Indian race can hardly be expected to undergo further development as an unmixed people. Its destiny must be realized in connection with the aggressive and efficient

race that broke into its continental isolation four centuries ago, and speedily made a pathetic wreck of its patiently evolved civilization. The best we can do is to save what we can of that priceless heritage and make every effort to comprehend it; then, since the development of our culture is largely a process of selection from the attainments of other peoples, avail ourselves eagerly of this which came from our own soil.

The task now is to investigate and understand the Indian culture in all its phases. The material side has received most attention and the languages have been industriously studied. In the recovery and interpretation of purely spiritual survivals, students are few, though it is the most inviting and most promising phase of American anthropological research. As the Indian enters into citizenship that is alien to his native culture, it is imperative that the record of his racial life be made complete and true. It is the problem of artist and poet, as well as of historian and scientist, to do justice to the race which has given to the world its best example of orderly, integrated racial life. The Indian is the result of the first and only process of Americanization

that has been carried to completion. This may have some bearing upon practical problems of today.

There should be a destiny for the American Indian more honorable than to be exploited as material for stirring fiction and spectacular exhibition. His is a race of splendid works and noble characteristics—a people who, in spite of the appalling adversities of the last four centuries, may by blending with its conquerors and at the same time preserving its own arts look forward to a future on the high plane of its ancient traditions.

Classical archaeology has long had its constituency of scholars, consistently true to the ancient shrines, keeping alive the literature, art and drama of the people who set standards for the modern world. The Indian race has had few to maintain its sacred fires. The disposition has been to put them out rather than to preserve them. The race has been interpreted to the world almost wholly by its alien conquerors.

Between us and the Greeks, only time intervenes, and but a small span of that when we think of it from the biological point of view.

Between us and the Indian is the racial chasm which no mind can quite bridge. No Caucasian will ever see with the eyes or think with the brain-cells of the Indian, the Oriental or the Negro. The mind, culture, character of a branch of the white race may become relatively transparent to us by personal contact or through study of cultural products; but the mind of the Indian remains a profound abyss, that of the Oriental an inscrutable mystery, of the Negro a portentous force.

It would do no harm to forget most of the efforts that have been made to explain the Indian race and let its works tell the story. The living Indian is not much inclined to explain through the usual channels. He is uncommunicative about himself—the antithesis of the white man. Literary record is absent and vocal representation not much used. But these can be spared, for the race has, like every other, revealed itself in its art. There was no conscious effort to do it. So the picture is true. What the race actually thought, felt, did, is clear. Words would only obscure.

The archaeological heritage from the unknown

America of two or three millennia furnishes an authentic history of the Indian people. It is their own picture of themselves, their testimony as to how they met and tried to solve the problems that all humanity has confronted.

There has been a singular tendency to think of the ancient masterworks of the race found in Mexico, Central America and South America as other than Indian art. It is necessary to repeat again and again that all native American remains, whether of plains tribes, mound-builders, cliff-dwellers, Pueblo, Navajo, Toltec, Aztec, Maya, Inca, are just the works of the Indian. Plain fiction and romantic archaeology have a firm hold on the reading public.

Only a few peoples of antiquity attempted such gigantic works as did the Incas in Peru, the Mayas in Central America, the Aztecs and their predecessors on the Mexican plateau, the cliff-dwellers of our own Southwest. The monuments of Quirigua, Tiahuanaco, Teotihuacan, Chaco Canyon, testify to a physical and mental virility of the highest order. Masterworks of art, in sculpture, stucco and mosaic; achievements in design and color exhibited in the

textile and ceramic arts, show highly developed and trained esthetic sense.

The ancient government of Pueblo towns was a model of statecraft worthy of Switzerland. The structures of purely spiritual character expressed in the mythology and ritual of the plains tribes, denote a speculative religion, free from the mysticism of the Orient and the dogmatism of European faiths, based on observation of and reflection on the orderly processes of nature. The religion of the Indian measures up well with our own in spiritual character.

The life of the Indian, on the evidence of his cultural remains, was marvelously unified and socialized. Virtually every form of activity, esthetic, industrial, social, was at the same time the practice of his religion. In quest of food, sitting in council, taking part as musician or dancer or priest in the ceremony, developing the symbolic design on utensil or garment, building the sanctuary, erecting the monolith, dedicating the temple and embellishing it with color and plastic art—he was putting his whole spiritual life into it, and always with the thought of “the people,” never of the individual or self.

The race has left no personal history—only tribal or communal.

Solicitude for "the people," exaltation of the tribe, was and still is a constant trait of Indian character. If individuals became prominent as priests, warriors, or builders, they were never personally glorified. Always it was: "The people thought," "the people went out," "the people built," "the old people say." Wisdom was of "the ancients." The ancestor was venerated but not mentioned by name. It is safe to predict that when the Indian hieroglyphic inscriptions of Central America are fully understood there will be found in them nothing of the boastful tone of individual power which characterizes the records of ancient Babylonians, Egyptians, Romans, modern Europeans and Americans, and probably very little of what is usually called history.

The native American race exemplifies better than any other the influence of stone in human evolution. No traces of Bronze-Age man are encountered. To the end of its undisturbed epoch, it remained a "Stone-Age" people. It demonstrated the potentiality of stone unaided

by metal. A surviving Stone-Age people, it may have been older as a race than the conquering Europeans, an Iron-Age people. Those terms are not to be regarded as denoting progressive efficiency in civilization.

In esthetic, ethical, and social culture, the Indians surpassed their conquerors. In material development they fell short of the Europeans. In the use of physical forces they were the inferior race, as the ancient Greeks would have been, and the Hebrews. The races most advanced in material culture are not necessarily to be ranked as superior. Present indications point to their easy and rapid self-destruction instead of to the long maturity and slow decay of the races that placed the emphasis on the spiritual life. It is not certain that high material progress is conducive to racial longevity. Efficiency in civilization is mainly a matter of racial point of view.

The Indian race and its achievements, then, constitute America's archaeological heritage and afford the subject-matter for the study of human history on this continent. It has a very intimate and particular interest to us in the United

States where we have forcibly intervened in its destiny and where it is being slowly incorporated into our citizenship. There is outward submission to the white race, but with lack of understanding on both sides. Almost all trouble in dealing with the Indians would disappear if one group of facts could be clearly apprehended: namely, that it is neither through stupidity nor perverseness that peace-loving, order-loving Indians resist the well-meant efforts for their betterment. It is simply the conflict between age-old ideals of authority, morality, justice—ours seeming as perverted to them as theirs seem to us. If it is their destiny to accept our standards, it should at least be made for them a matter of deliberate selection rather than forcible imposition. The results of the evolutionary forces in racial color, physiognomy, mentality, culture, cannot be suddenly overthrown. The imposition of alien culture upon a subjugated people is a mistake for which the conquerors usually pay a high price.

If the Indian believes that a promise should be inviolable; that authority is the will of all and must be obeyed; that the observance of his

own ceremonies is religion and ours paganism; that obedience to his own social order is morality and some of our customs revolting; that some things that look unholy to us are of the deepest spiritual moment to him; that he has rights with reference to his ancient shrines, ceremonies, sacred places, garb, moral and social canons, it is not to be put down to total depravity. He is simply guilty of belonging to the race that thinks it came "from the womb of the Earth-Mother" instead of the one that believes its common ancestor to have been fashioned "from the dust of the ground."

Viewed from any standpoint, it is a noble heritage that comes down to us from the long past of America—a heritage of experience, of thought, of expression, recorded in art, religion, social order; results of fervent aspiration and mighty effort; a race pressing its way toward the sun, running its course and passing into the shadows. Its study is the finest aspect of the conservation movement—an attempt to rescue and preserve the life-history of a great division of the human species.

It is to the glory of the American Indian race

that it developed a type of government entirely different from that of the European and more effective. The welfare of the people was the supreme end of government. If individuals became prominent, they were never personally glorified. In America the idea of monarchy had no place. The European, and in this I include the American of today, relinquishes painfully his preconceived ideas. "Empires of the Montezumas" seem necessary for his intellectual satisfaction. May we now drop these childish classifications and see the Indian in the light of his finer achievement in government; that is, a type free from monarchical authority? The typical government throughout the Americas was republican. There were numerous variants, but the fundamentals remained constant. There was no kingship and could not be in such a social structure, not even among the advanced cultures of Mexico and Central America. Nomenclature is persistent and hard to break away from. Europeans could see in a powerful chief only a king. If he happened to be the chief over a number of chiefs of towns or tribes temporarily associated for defense, as Montezuma in Mexico, he must

be an "emperor" and his domain an "empire." Hence the "Empire of the Montezumas"—the old and new "empires" of the Maya. These Indian emperors, kings, empires, etc., are the creation of Spanish chroniclers and romantic historians and archaeologists, based upon traditional European patterns of government. The Indians have never had to junk any royal crowns or thrones or dynasties as Europe has at such bloody cost. They got started in a different direction from ours. The perfectly ordered community was the aim and end and agency of government, and there organization stopped. All the people participated in all the community activities, government, building, worshipping, making war when combat became inevitable. Though there were many valiant warriors there were no Napoleons. There will be more on this subject later.

To people educated under our traditions, it is well-nigh impossible to conceive of civilization without nationality. "National aspirations," "national honor," these are ideas that go with the white skin. Our passion for organization, for offensive and defensive alliances among

societies and states, grows out of the propensity for meddling in one another's affairs which seems inherent in European peoples, including modern Americans. Alliances and leagues, treaties and laws innumerable testify to this inability to get on without interference with one another.

Whatever the forces were that directed the evolutionary processes in the European race to the white skin, the contentious spirit, the passion for individual glory, the determination to rule, they were and are inescapable. It is not possible for the European to conceive of a better state of society than that attained by way of mighty ambitions, mighty conflicts, mighty individual power. He succeeds in formulating a body of doctrines with which to transform the social, political and economic state of man. Given the opportunity to try it out, he proceeds by the only method the European knows to direct his ideal, arriving at just what the European always has arrived at by European methods: namely, the state organized by force, maintained by force, depending upon force for its existence. When Europe accepted, theoretically, an oppo-

site ideal for human society and took over an Oriental conception, it did not long handle it by the gentle methods of Galilee, nor did the results bear much resemblance to the spiritual structure exemplified in the life and teachings of the Son of Man. Splendor of priesthood and magnificence of church, inquisition and stake, slaughter of Christian nations by Christian nations—these are curious derivatives from a social order founded on humility and tolerance and the “love thy neighbor as thyself” idea. But it is the European way.

America had a different effect upon its human population. Whatever the forces were that directed the evolutionary processes in the native race to the attainment of the red skin, the idea of life in harmony with the program of nature, of satisfaction in esthetic and spiritual activity rather than in material progress and power, they did their work effectively. The culture of the Indian can only be destroyed by killing the Indian. The Pueblo is the best surviving example of native American culture. In it are preserved the physical, intellectual and spiritual elements that characterize the native American race.

From New Mexico to Central America the sedentary Indians developed a system of land tenure which was eminently satisfactory to them. There was no individual ownership of land. Title was in the community, though heads of families enjoyed practically permanent tenure, conditioned upon a proper use of the land and the performance of a fair share of the community work. Moreover, no community appropriated more land than was necessary to provide for immediate needs. What saving in blood and treasure would have accrued to Mexico if its ruling class during the past four hundred years could have understood and granted to its Indian population the system of land tenure which it thoroughly understood and had enjoyed for ages! It is safe to predict that Mexico will become a permanently tranquil country when its governing class restores to the Indian population secure possession of community lands. (Chapter I, *Ancient Life in the American Southwest*).

America was a continent of isolation, of vast solitudes, of limitless spaces, of well-defined physical areas, such as the western plains, the

southwestern desert, the Mexican table-land, Central America, and the high plateau of Peru and Bolivia. It invited an expansive life. There was nowhere any problem of over-population. There was little excuse for conflict between tribes. There was room for all. Natural resources provided what man needed without intensive effort. There were everywhere conditions of nature which stimulate the imagination, induce reverent contemplation, bind man to his soil. These conditions were favorable to the development of religion, esthetic life, and social structure. There was not the intensive struggle, the conflict of interests which focus the thought of people on material things and intensify practical activities. Moreover, the race was of a single origin, essentially Oriental in its psychology which was fairly well established before reaching America.

This was the antithesis of Europe, where for millennia our forebears, ethnic breeds of little degree of like-mindedness, fought for the frontiers which they deemed essential to existence. There has been incessant conflict of interest, the struggle for subsistence, for control of the routes

of trade and the freedom thereof, for economic advantages of every sort, for a place in the sun, for strategic positions of defense. All this produced the seething caldron of warring nations, of ancient hatreds that have grown and intensified for ages. While we dare to hope that Europe may some time be composed into peace, we do not overlook the plain truth that the conditions above described have compelled the European peoples to fight for every possible physical advantage in the past and may in the future. Swift advance in material civilization, mastery of forces, constructive and destructive, have brought us to the pinnacle of material supremacy which we enjoy, or, at any rate, spend our lives in maintaining.

During the centuries of European advance, much of the Orient and all of America kept the tranquil ways of the Stone Age. Racial mind was in the making just the same. The activities of these races, whatever they were, produced a brain development equal to any in the world and mental power unrivaled in certain ways. But these ways were spiritual rather than material. If we could represent with a series of

curves the progress of the various types of culture in the races we are discussing, it would seem that with the Europeans the material curve mounts to great heights, while with the Orientals and the native American race it remains at a low level. When we consider the development of spiritual culture, the curve is reversed. The European remains low and the other mounts. Europeans are people of mechanical inventions; Orientals, and Indians, of religious conceptions and esthetic values.

Mind is made by its experiences, and experiences are partly a matter of choice. It would seem that the spiritual pursuits, art and religion, of those whom we call inferior, have been quite as potent in developing brain as have our material activities. We lump these races together as heathen, displace their culture with ours, which may be good for us but deadly for them. We give them a religion which is not ours to begin with, and demonstrations of efficiency which they rarely envy, while they calmly wonder why these violent peoples of the West never stop for the solid enjoyment of sitting in silent meditation upon the graves of their ancestors.

The result when civilizations that rest on such different foundations come in conflict can never be in doubt. The question of ultimate stability may remain open. We have not made ourselves entirely secure in our greatness; our faith in ourselves has been shaken recently. But we have wrought tragic results on the peoples whose culture rested on foundations unlike ours. Of these the best example is the American Indian.

The Pueblos are the surviving remnants of a people that were distributed over a region as extensive as France or the former German Empire in Europe. It was not an area that could be completely inhabited, however. Expanses of desert intervened between the fertile valleys, and these stretches were only sparsely settled, though it is astonishing to find over these desert wastes numerous remains of human habitations where now the prairie-dogs alone find sustenance. The large valleys were comfortably populated. There was no occasion for overcrowding. There were no cities, either in point of population or political organization. Neither was there anything comparable to our scattered individual house population. Everywhere it was town or village

life. In other words, the community was the unit in the political structure—in so far as there was any. The community was a closely knit, highly organized body, a remarkable structure made up of clans, fraternities, priesthoods, with civil and religious authority sharply defined and provided for by election, never by inheritance.

But with the community, organization ceased. There was no state or nation in the sense of an organization of the whole body of inhabitants in independent governments. Each community was a miniature republic, but there was no permanent association of communities. Every one was a separate entity. A number of towns might in time of emergency act together under a common chief, but this never constituted a lasting alliance.

It would seem that the Rio Grande Pueblos, separated one from another by only a few miles and all having the same interests, would at least have a common council, but such is not the case. Occasionally, a number of the towns have joined in sending delegations to Washington. Several times a grand council of the Pueblo towns has met to consider their perennial land troubles,

but no "league of nations" resulted or ever will of their volition. The community is self-contained and minds its own business to the extent that white communities can not account for.

The governing body in ancient times was the council, with chief and head men. At present it is the governor and principales. The governor is elected for a limited term, usually a year. The council of principales or head men is made up of those who have held the office of governor. It is, therefore, a government of elder statesmen. The war captain, his once glorious occupation now reduced to matters of boundaries, fences, stock trespass, and police duty at religious functions, is an executive officer of the council, elective, and of equal rank with the governor. The latter has his *teniente* (lieutenant), elective, and *alguacil* (constable), appointive. There are no emoluments, and no competition to "serve the people." The office actually seeks the man, not by way of the primary or the convention, but by direct choice of heads of families in council—male suffrage only. This present arrangement was made for the Pueblos by a white administration, but it was a modification of the

ancient form preserving the fundamentals of the aboriginal system. It is essentially republican, government by representatives of the people, and has been so from time immemorial.

We can truthfully say that these surviving Pueblo communities constitute the oldest existing republics. It must be remembered, however, that they were only vest-pocket editions. No two villages nor group of villages ever came under a common authority or formed a state. There is not the faintest tradition of a "ruler" over the whole body of Pueblos, nor an organization of the people of this vast territory under a common government. There is no tradition of "rulers" of any kind. The people managed their affairs through chosen representatives. It is sometimes said that the actual rulers of the Pueblos were and are the caciques, the two religious heads of the community. This is not correct. True, they are elected for life, never hereditary, and are much revered, but they are subject to the council and are amenable to its discipline. Cases are on record of a cacique who had been publicly whipped by order of the council. The people rule.

The Pueblos exemplify to an extent not achieved by any other people in the world to my knowledge, except the Indians of Old Mexico and Central America to whom they are culturally related, the community type of social structure as distinct from the state or national type. However, there was no common ownership in crops or other personal property. In fact, there was no community property save in the land, sanctuaries, and the religious paraphernalia. Occupants of the great community houses virtually owned the apartment occupied. Tenure was for the life of not only the family but the clan, and there were no transfers of ownership. When a clan died out, the apartment was abandoned. For that reason, portions of community houses are often seen in ruins while the town is still well populated.

What is the lesson to be derived from Pueblo communism? Simply that developing naturally as it did through the ages along with the color of the skin, and all the elements of his character, it was a good way for the Pueblo, as was his religion. That a similar system would fit a people of our race which has developed a totally differ-

ent character through ages of totally different experience is as absurd as to expect the leopard to change his spots or the Ethiopian his skin by simply deciding to do so.

In Mexico, the Aztecs have held the stage for four historic centuries, with several hundred years of antecedent tradition. The writings about them fill libraries. In twentieth-century language, the Aztecs have had, since the discovery, a most efficient press service. Certainly no people in all history have been more brilliantly written up or persistently glorified. As with modern propaganda, there has been effective playing up of what they were not and persistent ignoring of what they actually were. This commenced with the Conquest, for reasons that are readily understandable. But there is no excuse for perpetually handing on the glamorous, fantastic picture of Aztec life that every archaeologist knows to be misleading. As heretofore stated, those attributes of European civilization—kings, counts, lords, palaces—were unknown to aboriginal America. The first European witnesses of the spectacular ceremonies of the Indians wrote of them in terms with which they

were familiar, terms of European civilization. If for those we substitute chiefs, councils, headmen, pueblos, we have a fairly accurate nomenclature in terms of Indian culture history. On this subject, I wish to quote the late Professor Marshall Saville, from an article published by the Heye Foundation, Museum of the American Indian:

It may be stated at the outset that the use of the term "king" is inappropriate in connection with the rulers of Mexico, or indeed of any part of aboriginal America. Among the Aztecs the term used was *tlatoani*, defined as meaning great or chief lord, or overlord, or speaker. The Haitian word *cacique* was extensively used by early chroniclers to designate the priest-chiefs of the mainland throughout America, and it has been incorporated into the Castilian language with this significance. The word *tlatoani*, referring to Mexican "chief lords," is much to be preferred, as it more nearly expresses the true function of a ruler in this part of ancient America. Usage is so strong, however, that it has become customary to use the term "king," as was done by the early English writers on the American colonies; but there were never kings or emperors in America, in the sense in which those terms

were used in the Old World. Similarly misleading is the term "empire" which has come into general usage to designate the native governments of ancient Middle and South America.

In sober truth, the "kingdoms" around the Lake of Texcoco, at the time of the Conquest, would probably have matched the half-dozen adobe towns of prehistoric Zúñi (Cibola), or Hopi (Tusayan), except for their more pretentious plazas or temple precincts. The houses of Tenochtitlan were more numerous, perhaps more commodious, than those of New Mexico's Taos—probably quite similar in their multiple stories and broad terraces. Nowhere in the Toltec-Aztec country were such substantial residences ever built as in the Chaco Canyon of New Mexico, nor as in the less well built pueblos of the Rio Grande Valley. The great houses of the American Southwest have endured through centuries even of abandonment. Not even foundations of comparable structures remain in Mexico or Central America, though the cultures were contemporaneous, and all have been equally subjected to the ravages of time and civilization. In

short, religious life, exhibited in temple building for spectacular ceremonies, was the outstanding factor in Toltec-Aztec culture, as it was also with Central and South American peoples.

. That there was colossal misrepresentation of the political and civic status of Mexico is supported by other than archaeological evidence. In the matter of population, there was the same over-statement of fact, probably for similar reasons. It was quite as natural to falsify cultural conditions as to exaggerate population. All went to intensify the glamor of the Conquest and to augment the favor of government and the church. As a basis for examining the population estimates of the Conquest period, note the results of recent studies by trained investigators. Dr. Karl Sapper, German geographer, University of Marburg, figuring from subsistence and other geographical evidence, estimated the entire indigenous population of the American continent in 1492 at a maximum of from 40,000,000 to 50,000,000. Dr. A. L. Kroeber, University of California, places it at 8,400,000. Various others arrive between these extremes. I am impressed with the method and results of Professor Angel

Rosenblatt's recent study of the problem. He approaches it from the economic standpoint and arrives at the estimate of 13,385,000, for the entire continent of America. After considering the procedure and results of all who have attempted the problem, I am disposed to adhere to Rosenblatt's figures. Consider now the estimates of the Conquest period. Father Las Casas, staunch protagonist for the Indians, declared that 4,000,000 were exterminated during the twelve years following the invasion by Cortéz—an incredible slaughter, nearly one-third of all the Indians on the entire continent, from Alaska to Patagonia. Clavigero claims that 6,000,000 (nearly one-half the population of the continent!) assembled to witness the dedication of the great temple in Mexico, in 1486. Cortéz wrote the King of Spain about the defeat in battle of 149,000 Tlaxcalans by his 400 soldiers—a bit over 370 to the man. Then comes Juan Diaz de la Calle with 43,000,000 Indians baptized in Mexico by the Franciscans—more than three times the entire population of America at that time. These are fair examples of unreliable population estimates. In the face of this, it is

not hard to believe that the magnificence of life depicted at the same time was even more luridly colored.

The difficulty of sifting the documentary accounts concerning ancient America has long been recognized. Nearly fifty years ago, Adolph Bandelier wrote:

Not only the history of ancient Mexico, but the true condition and degree of culture of its aboriginal inhabitants, are yet but imperfectly known. Nearly all architectural remains have disappeared; the descendants of the former aborigines have modified their plan of life, and we are almost exclusively reduced, for our knowledge of Mexican antiquities, to the printed and written testimony of those who saw Indian society in Mexico either at the time of, or not too long after, its downfall. But these authors, whether eye-witnesses of the conquest, like Cortes, Bernal Diaz del Castillo, Andres de Tapia, and others; or missionaries sent to New Spain at an early date, —as Toribio of Benavente (Motolinia), Sahagun, or (towards the close of the 16th century, or beginning of the 17th century) Acosta, Davila, Mendieta and Torquemada, —they are sometimes, on many questions, in

direct opposition to each other. Thus the uncertainty is still increased, and the most difficult critical labor heaped upon the student. Furthermore, to magnify the task, we are placed in presence of several Indian writers of the 16th and 17th centuries (like Duran, Tezozomoc, and Ixtlilxochitl), who disagree with each other on the most important questions, quite as much as the Spanish authors themselves. It may appear presumptuous, while knowing of the existence of such difficulties, to attempt the description of even a single feature of life of Mexico's former Indian society.

Central America might well be called Mayaland. It is not a spacious country—only some five hundred miles in extent north to south. With some archaeologists it is customary to divide Maya history into "Old Empire" and "New Empire"; the latter embracing the northern Yucatecan sites; the former, all the rest—west, middle, and south—on the assumption that this is a correct chronological grouping; even though, as generally admitted, the implication as to type of government is all wrong. As is well known, I long since rejected the term "empire" as being totally inapplicable to any

government that ever existed in aboriginal America. Thomas Gann, in his history of the Maya, in collaboration with Eric Thompson, criticizes the term from another point of view. He says, "The history of the Maya was formerly divided up into that of the Old and New Empires, the former occupying the southern part of the Maya area up to about the beginning of the seventh century A.D., the latter, the peninsula of Yucatan, from that period to the Spanish Conquest. Later research, however, has shown that this classification is inaccurate and misleading, as both Yucatan and the south were occupied simultaneously from very early times." Mr. Gann, however, retains the term "as a matter of convenience." Since it is inaccurate and misleading in both vital respects, I do not feel justified in using it, however convenient it might be.

The country of the Incas in South America was known to them as Tawantinsuyo. It was one of the most remarkable developments of society that ever happened in the human race. This much we know about Inca society, or Quechua Society of the Inca period. We may sum it up as follows:

It was a cultural structure that arose in the Andean province of Cuzco out of an amalgamation of obscure clans. It became dominant in Andean life in both the high sierra and the coast from Ecuador to Chile. Its supremacy over this whole region lasted a scant half-century—Quito soon broke away and actually for a short time dominated Cuzco. The entire period of rise, maturity, and distintegration was not more than four centuries. The dominant culture traits were: (a) Veneration of the Sun—inherited from the earlier cultural age; (b) ambition for conquest resulting in the vast extension above described; (c) a conception of the Inca world as "Four Regions" slightly reminiscent of Pueblo cosmography—four "world quarters"; (d) community land tenure, with special perquisites to religious and military leaders; (e) government essentially republican in type, in that the interests of the people were represented by chiefs and headmen who, because of the authority permitted them, took on both religious and military functions. (Note how among the most advanced of American Indians, veneration of *authority* came to be veneration of the *person* in whom

authority was vested.) Chieftaincy was, in the "heroic age," hereditary—perhaps also in the earlier time. We have in three Incas a rudimentary dynasty, but it is quite safe to say that during this period the best man was consistently on top, regardless of ancestry. The genius for organization was incarnate in those three men of the bronze race—Pachacuti, Tupac Yupanqui, and Yuayna Capac. (Atahualpa was the equal of the greatest of them, but destiny was against him.) The structure that they erected, though of short duration, was the crowning achievement of the Indian race in government. There was never in old-world history anything comparable to it.

It has been persistently deformed by forcing it into an old-world pattern. To warp it into European "empire" is simply to destroy its unique significance. The first offenders in this were the early Spanish chroniclers. The youthful Cieza de Leon had no apperceptive ideas from which to interpret the new phenomena that he was seeing and no vocabulary with which to describe them. Sarmiento was under orders from his boss to misrepresent. The vagaries of Monte-

sinos place him outside the ranks of reliable historians. Garcilaso de la Vega was the greatest writer and greatest offender of all. He was part Indian, Spanish-educated. As a child he listened to the folklore and mythology of his family. He obtained his traditions from anything but pure Indian informants. He lived all his mature life in Spain, wrote as a Spaniard, not from records but from dimly remembered sources. He was intensely proud of his Indian blood—had a right to be—and spent his life building up the glamorous picture of the past of his people. He was a facile writer and his words have carried conviction to thousands of readers and most of the historians that have followed him in describing the life and times of the Incas. He was the “empire builder” *par excellence*. The moderns have nearly all accepted his picture. I can not. After forty years of this business I have come to “see Indian and think Indian” to a considerable extent, and this standardized picture of ancient Andean life that is being handed on from one generation to another *is not Indian*. It is entirely below the Indian culture level. Dr. Moises Saenz, who accepts the old non-Indian pattern

for the most part, makes a fine, true statement where he says in his work *Upon the Peruvian Indian and His Incorporation into the Nation Center*.

From the point of view of the sociologist who contemplates a program of nationalistic formation there is no more interesting aspect of the Inca civilization than that which has relation to the policy of consolidation and of cultural and spiritual integration. The most outstanding feat of all the stupendous work of the Incas was the fusion of the infinite human elements of the Peruvian world which they came to dominate: race, religion, language, social forms, government, all were different in the elements which they at last amalgamated. That union acquired a degree of perfection whose equal the continent has not seen again.

In cultural integration the Andean Indian stands unequalled among the races of men. But all this antedated the Incas. They took advantage of this deep-seated culture trait, added elements of superstition to it; built up the veneration of the Inca to where the mind of the chief was the sole mind of the people.

Herein lay the cause of the quick collapse of Tawantinsuyo. When a crisis came, the veneration of the person of the Inca reached the point of absolute surrender of individual initiative and individual freedom. When the Inca came to control his subjects mentally, he controlled all that they had or did. No government can endure in which there is no free initiative on the part of the governed. Rulers from chief to emperor like to invest themselves with the atmosphere of divinity. They like to have it thought that they can make no mistakes in judgment. "The king can do no wrong." Subjects who accept this doctrine surrender the thing that humanity has fought for through the ages; the thing that is cherished above everything else by normal men, that is freedom. This means the surrender of manhood. It is the absolute acknowledgment of collective helplessness. When Pizarro killed the Inca at Cajamarca he killed Tawantinsuyo at a blow. Such is the appalling inferiority complex of totalitarian society.

So as we examine ancient society on the American continent, we find an entirely different pattern in government from that of the Old World.

It is worth while to know that in human affairs government *can* function effectively without the agency of the state. It may be true that fanatical "nationalism" of the European pattern has come perilously near to wrecking civilization in our time.

